

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring placing on the free list bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of citizens in the city of South Haven, county of Van Buren and State of Michigan, requesting appropriation by Congress for the purchase of a site for a post office and the erection thereon of a proper building; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of State of North Dakota, favoring passage of H. R. 26791, known as the Hanna bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of farmers of the State of North Dakota, protesting against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Keen, Wahpeton, N. Dak., protesting against the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Resolution of citizens of New York, protesting against any alliance with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Bedford, State of Pennsylvania, against parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Resolutions of Wethersfield Business Men's and Civic Association, of Wethersfield, Conn., opposing the passage of the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution of Chelsea (Me.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in relation to a measure pertaining to reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Seward Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers of Albany, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Cordage Co., favoring the placing on the free list of jute cotton bagging and russla rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Anson F. Love and 14 other residents of Hubbard Lake, Mich., favoring parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of New York Cordage Co., favoring the placing on the free list of jute cotton bagging and russla rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Albany, N. Y., against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Douds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: Telegraphic petitions by J. A. Delfelder, president Wyoming Wool Growers; Sweetwater County Wool Growers' Association; Eastern Wyoming Wool Growers' Association; Lewis Barker, commissioner central district; J. J. Bentley, commissioner northern district; J. S. Atherly, secretary board of sheep commissioners, State of Wyoming; and F. S. King, commissioner southern district, protesting against

a reduction of the wool schedule or any action relative thereto until after the Tariff Board shall make their report; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of employees of Keystone Paper Mill & Paper Manufacturing Co., Upper Darby, Pa., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Charles E. Vrooman & Co., of Carthage, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, N. Y., in favor of Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Resolution of Lime Rock Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Central Labor Union, of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring the construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petitions of farmers of Clarkfield; voters of the county of Yellow Medicine; citizens of Balaton; Tracy Farmers' Elevator Co.; legal voters of Lone Tree, county of Chippewa; and residents of Yellow Medicine County, all of the State of Minnesota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition against removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring placing cotton ties and bagging on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward Olmsted, captain, in favor of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Local, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 19, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Our Father in heaven, help us to appreciate Thy goodness and Thy wonderful works unto the children of men, that we may think nobly, feel deeply, and act worthily in the vocation whereunto Thou has called us, and thus hallow Thy name. In the spirit of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTING ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF APPROPRIATION ACTS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported House joint resolution 1, to correct errors of certain appropriation acts, approved March 4, 1911, which was read a first and second time and, together with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 5), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make the point of order, but I desire to say that this is not in order as a privileged matter on this holy day—Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the matters I wish to report are not privileged, but I desire to call them to the attention of the House.

Mr. MANN. I understood that the gentleman from Alabama would like to make a motion to suspend with proceeding under that calendar.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order, the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. There is no business for what is called Calendar Wednesday, anyway.

EXPENSES OF FIRST SESSION SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by the direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 2, making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, which

was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 6), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

MILEAGE.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 3, making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 7), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

AMERICAN RED CROSS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 38, to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 8), referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that as the opportunity presents I shall endeavor to call these measures up for consideration.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to-day is Calendar Wednesday, but I understand that there is no business on the calendar. Calendar Wednesday can be dispensed with under the rules by a two-thirds vote of the House. I therefore move to dispense for to-day with the business that comes under the rule providing for Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. It has been decided by my predecessor that under the conditions as they prevail here to-day there is no necessity for the motion where there is no business on the calendar.

Mr. MANN. Of course it would require the calling of the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would necessitate the calling of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, to dispense with proceedings under the rule for Calendar Wednesday.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion was agreed to.

PLACING CERTAIN ARTICLES ON THE FREE LIST.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meat, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 4), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I offer the following resolution, to fill a minority place on a committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 111.

Resolved, That JAMES WICKERSHAM be, and he is hereby, elected as a Delegate member of the Committee on the Public Lands.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING VIEWS OF MINORITY.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the report just made from the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have leave to file their views.

The SPEAKER. Within how long a time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. DALZELL. Say, until the disposition of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We granted the gentleman the other day that time in reference to the bill then pending before the House because we immediately reported it. It has been almost a week since the Committee on Ways and Means agreed to this bill, and I would ask the gentleman whether, if he should have permission to make a report by Monday, would that not be time enough?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; Monday will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] have until Monday to file the views of the minority in reference to the bill H. R. 4413, which has been reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have until Monday to file the views of the minority (H. Rept. 4, pt. 2) on the bill H. R. 4413. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GUDGER].

[Mr. GUDGER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire what the balance of time is; how much has been consumed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], and myself?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used, including the time yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts, 8 hours and 40 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has used 6 hours and 56 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to consume enough time to equalize it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield so much time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, not, in my judgment, since the War with Spain and all that followed it, of benefit and of burden, has there been considered by the House of Representatives so important a bill as the one now pending. Therefore, it is entitled, without passion and without prejudice, to the careful, candid consideration of this great body, 391 in number, representing 92,000,000 of people, for on its consideration and enactment or defeat, in my judgment, rests the well-being and the prosperity of all of the people of the United States.

I represent a district agricultural in part—I think perhaps one of the best in the United States—and in part a manufacturing district. When I state that in my district there are many thousands of men in organized union labor, in mine and in factory, you will at once understand that I represent people who produce not only in the factory, but in the mine and on the farm. The output of coal from two townships in my own county is over 3,000,000 tons annually, and the output and development are rapidly increasing.

But, aside from the interests of my own district, I want to stand here and say that I am equally anxious to promote the welfare of every American citizen, whether in Greater New York, the mightiest of all our cities, in Chicago, the second city in the United States, or in Philadelphia, the third. I want to do what is best for all the people, North and South, East and West, as we stretch from 49° on the north down to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. When I vote on this bill I vote for legislation that goes to every fireside, and I would not receive my own approval or retain my own self-respect if I stood attempting to array section against section, industry against industry, farmer against factory man, capitalist, or railroad man.

So I approach the discussion of this important bill from the standpoint of the best interests of all. That much by way of introduction.

It is proposed, on slight consideration, to vitalize into law an agreement that will throw, without let or hindrance, into the United States the market furnished by 92,000,000 of people the agricultural products of 8,000,000 people in Canada. Now, if this is to our advantage, in Heaven's name let us do it. If it be to our disadvantage, as we shall answer to our own self-respect and judgment, and later on to our constituents, let us not do it. And in cold blood I am going to inquire, as briefly as possible, whether it ought to be done or not.

REVENUE BILLS SHOULD NOT ORIGINATE WITH THE EXECUTIVE.

Mind you, so far as the country is concerned, so far as the Senate is concerned, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, this bill, except by virtue of two amendments added to it, was not prepared in accordance with the Constitution. Our fathers wisely provided that revenue measures should have their origin in the House and that the Senate might amend.

They wisely provided that while the President may recommend legislation he only becomes a coordinate branch of the legislative body when the House and Senate have agreed on bills, which, if they are revenue bills, must originate in the House. Then he only has power to approve on the one hand or disapprove on the other, which disapproval is efficient, unless two-thirds of the House and Senate pass the bill notwithstanding that disapproval.

Here is a measure that was made in secret. Is there anybody within the sound of my voice on either side of this House, whether he is for or against this bill, far-reaching as it is, affecting every hearthstone, if vitalized, who will say that he knew anything about this agreement until we received the President's message, with the accompanying bill, which was formally introduced in the House at the last session by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall]? I pause for an answer. No man arises in his place in this great body and says he was consulted.

When we come to deal with foreign countries, the Constitution provides that a treaty made by the Executive, and vitalized by the approval of the Senate by a two-thirds majority, shall be the supreme law. What did our fathers mean when they provided in this manner for the making of treaties which should be the supreme law of the land? They knew that the world was large, with conflicting interests, diverse civilizations, governments differing in their organization. So the great power of negotiating treaties was placed in the hands of the President, but to become effective they must be vitalized by the concurrence of the Senate, not by a majority, not in a minute, not under the previous question, but after serious consideration in executive session and by a two-thirds vote. Looking in your eyes, Mr. Chairman, I say there have been treaties made even under the safeguards of the Constitution, after full consideration, that have not been wise.

Take the War with Spain. Ex-Speaker Reed once said, "When you go to war no man knows the end thereof." We went into that war because gentlemen on the other side, being in the minority, moved by a spirit of altruism, crossed on a little bit of politics, grew very patriotic, and we on this side also grew very patriotic. War was declared. The end thereof was the Philippines, responsibility for Cuba and for Porto Rico. To indicate that mistakes perchance may sometimes be made in the making of treaties, even with the two-thirds majority required in the Senate for ratification, we have the Philippines, in my judgment, for all time. We say on the stump, "Oh, we are going to civilize them and make them competent for self-government, and then we are going to tell them, 'Go forth and govern yourselves.'"

The treaty was concluded. Now, I am not speaking of the peerless leader, Mr. Bryan, to criticize; but it was necessary for him with his great personality to come to Washington and exercise his great influence to bring about the ratification of that treaty. He has been down here again performing the same function. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He put his strong hand and eloquent tongue upon his party friends in the Senate and the necessary majority was furnished to ratify that treaty. When a thing is accomplished I never grumble. I would not refer to it now did I not aim merely to illustrate how important it is in a government by the people under the Constitution to observe the law not only in the letter but in the spirit.

You may say that a government of the people is so wise and good and patriotic that no advantage can be taken of it. Nevertheless, when you deal with the nations of the world, when you deal, through the mother country, with our friends across the Canadian border, you want to be mindful of a favorite expression of an old constituent of mine who dropped now and then into a little bit of poetry. He was my client. He said: "This is an exceedingly important matter." I replied, "The plaintiff is not a bad man." "Oh," said he, "Mr. Cannon, you don't know him; he may not be bad, but when it comes to material matters he steeps his tongue in honey and clothes his feet in the cunning of a fox." [Laughter.] That is true not only of individuals and parties, but it is especially true of great countries.

NO AUTHORITY TO MAKE TRADE AGREEMENTS.

This bill is to carry out what is called a reciprocal trade agreement. Has the President any authority in law by which he can make such agreements? I will let Mr. PAYNE, former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, answer that question. When Mr. PAYNE presented to the House the bill which bears his name and made his speech explaining and defending it, he was asked by Mr. Cox of Indiana:

Is there anything in this bill which would enable the President of the United States to negotiate any trade agreement with Germany?

Mr. PAYNE. There is not.

Mr. Cox of Indiana. Is there any other law in effect that would still authorize him to do that?

Mr. PAYNE. No law, except the general provisions of the Constitution allowing him to negotiate treaties and submit them to the Senate.

Now, what are the objections to this bill; first, from the standpoint of the farmer, who comprises one-third of our population; and, second, from the standpoint of the other two-thirds? What is for the best interest of all the people? In considering this matter I crave the attention of the House, and I will try not to be tedious.

Our 92,000,000 people have just scratched the resources of the United States. The countries of Europe, including Great Britain, have a population of from 300,000,000 to 350,000,000 people. With a country far better than Europe in quality of soil, in mineral wealth, and in resources of every kind, we can, when fully developed, easily support with bread and meat and clothing and everything, save the products of the Tropics, 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 people.

How rapidly we have grown and developed. I am not an old man, but I recollect very well when there were but 17,000,000 people in the United States. I have observed a great many things since that time. I recollect very well when there were not 100 miles of railway in all the country west of the Allegheny Mountains. I recollect very well when the only market was found in New Orleans for all the great Mississippi Valley, and I might say almost for the whole Middle West was found in New Orleans. The flatboats floated down the Mississippi carrying our products, and the little steamer came back laden with the products received in exchange.

I know what it is to have seen Ohio, Indiana, Missouri to a great extent, and Michigan and Iowa and all that country of the great West brought partially under subjection. On the Wabash, where you could cut the malaria with a knife [laughter], where the timber was thick and heavy, there was no place to plant corn or sow wheat. They did not believe that men could live on the rich prairies of the West. It was supposed that they never would be settled. It was worth a man's life to cut down the forest and bring 80 acres under subjection in that timbered section, and then when he built a new house, costing from \$700 to \$800 in labor, he died. Of course he did, he was worn out.

There was the same struggle in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, and in New York; and let me say to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall] that it was a long time after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers before they extended settlement and development very greatly in New England. I am old enough to recollect the time when those splendid lands in Illinois and Iowa, which could be obtained on military land warrants at 70 cents an acre, were supposed to be good for nothing except grazing. No one ever dreamed that the time would come when the lands in the Genesee Valley in New York would depreciate in value by one-half or more. At that time the tide of immigration from the East to the West had not set in to any great extent. The railroads came, and when I speak of the railroads—and I do it with pride—I think of that great Democratic statesman, Stephen A. Douglas. The quickening hand of development never struck the State of Illinois until 1850, when, under the leadership of Mr. Douglas, then a Senator of national reputation, there was enacted a law granting land to the State of Illinois, the alternate sections being reserved. Under and by virtue of that act the Illinois Central Railroad was constructed from Chicago to Cairo and from Centralia to Dunleith. The alternate sections were snapped up in the twinkling of an eye at \$2.50 an acre. Immigration set in. There was a chance to get to market. You all know the history of development since that time.

The war came—that great struggle that we all thank God resulted as it did. Then, from political and military necessity during the war it became necessary to begin the construction of a railroad to the Pacific coast. Deserts and mountains and Indians had to be overcome. The line ran through an uninhabited country, but that railroad was built in the fullness of time. Then came the Northern Pacific, and then the Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul. Then came James J. Hill, that wizard among business men, a great man who leads in doing great things, and with him came the building of the Great Northern from Duluth, reaching across the continent to Seattle and the Pacific. As a result the western country was settled pretty rapidly.

CAUSE OF ABANDONED FARMS IN THE EAST.

But what was happening in the meantime down in New York and New England? While the rich prairie lands in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois were being developed—virgin soil, such as it seems to me God never made anywhere else on earth—what was happening in the East?

Many of the bright, enterprising boys took Horace Greeley's advice and went west. They went in great droves and helped to develop that country. Railroads were built and transportation charges were brought down until you could place a barrel of flour made from wheat grown in Minnesota or Illinois or Missouri, manufactured in Minneapolis or St. Louis, into the market of a little hamlet anywhere in New England for less money than you could haul it in a wagon 3 miles. [Applause.] The result was that the lands in the Genesee Valley in northern New York and in New England could not compete with the production of those lands in the West, where you had only to tickle the earth to have it fructify and bring forth in marvelous abundance fruits and cereals.

The farmers in many sections of the East were placed at such disadvantage that many farms were abandoned in Connecticut, in Massachusetts, in all New England, in New York, and, to some extent, in Pennsylvania. There were more than 7,000,000 acres in abandoned farms in New England and New York. There was also a reduction of \$260,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same States in those 20 years. In the period from 1880 to the year 1900, even in magnificent Ohio, which has not yet lost the capacity to breed and produce Presidents, the farmers suffered a decrease of \$100,000,000 in the value of their farm lands in the presence of this competition from the West.

In developing the West we have sometimes suffered even from the excess of rich soil. I recall that upon the prairie in Illinois, within 50 miles of where I now live, with good railroad connections, with coal without limit deposited by the Almighty in the immediate neighborhood, I have seen corn, as good and sound as was ever grown, burned for fuel to keep the frost out. I merely speak of that to illustrate that our production was so great that the East, notwithstanding her decadence in agriculture, could not take our surplus. We had a long, weary road to travel, but men with brave hearts said "We want better markets; we will build more railroads"; and they got the railroads built.

It is needless to recount the growth and development of the middle and western sections of the country since 1860, when Abraham Lincoln was nominated as a candidate for the Presidency. Nor is it necessary to refer to the splendid cities that have sprung up—Chicago, the great market place for all the Middle West, which has grown from less than 100,000 people in 1860 to two and one-half millions of people, and countless other prosperous communities. It is, however, significant to note in connection with the consideration of this bill the remarkable, if not ominous, trend from the farm to the city, a movement which, in my opinion, will be stimulated by the enactment of this bill. To-day there is a far less percentage of people engaged in agriculture in the United States than there was in 1860. At that time more than one-half of our people were engaged in agricultural pursuits, while to-day the percentage is not over one-third. It is true that, aided by invention, with improved farm machinery, with the steam plow, the reaper, and the binder, one man on the farm now can do more than two or three men on the farm in the old days. But let us be honest; the same is true in all the walks of life. One man in a machine shop now can accomplish more than four men could have accomplished in 1860, until to-day the 92,000,000 people in the United States are producing more agricultural and more manufactured products—I measure my words in making the statement—than all Europe. That is a pretty strong statement, but it is true.

FREE LABOR V. SLAVE LABOR.

We fought out the economic question from 1861 to 1865. The Government's need for money, the necessity in the Northland to produce munitions of war, gave birth to the protective policy, and under it we prospered; while down South, with as good brain and brawn and as splendid manhood and womanhood as was to be found in the North they found difficulty in procuring proper arms and munitions and sufficient subsistence.

In that contest the great question touching labor was settled, and settled forever, in our country. The result was good for the North; it was good for the South; but it never would have been settled had it not been that roaming around in the body and brain of the average man, the mechanic and farmer, was a feeling that when a slave was doing in the South the work that elsewhere in the country was being done by an American sovereign, responsible for the control of the country, the dignity of labor was degraded.

With the close of that great struggle came an increased necessity for revenues to pay the Nation's debts, to pay pensions, to assist in the building of railways, to improve the great rivers and harbors, and the revenues were derived principally under

the policy of protection. We said that the foreigner paid most of the tax; you said it was paid by the individual who consumed. Well, I can not stop your saying that, and you can not stop my saying the other; but, lo and behold, what have we achieved? Under this policy of protection we have prospered, until we now have over one-fourth of all the wealth of all the world, and it is better distributed amongst our 92,000,000 of people than is the wealth of any other nation in the world. Now, it may be that you Democrats could have done a great deal better, and if I were to make that charge you would confess it [laughter]; but there is no way of turning the hands back on the dial, and I suppose you will just have to accept the results, because if you had continued that policy of servile labor for which you fought, the South, instead of having a renaissance, instead of having improvement of land and all values, instead of having increased production by three, would now, in my judgment, be practically deserted.

But what has that got to do with Canada? I will ask to have the map brought in. I always believe in kindergarten instruction. [Laughter and applause.] I learned more readily in that way than in any other.

The time came when we found it was necessary to improve our agriculture; and I thank God for the instruction that is being given in our colleges, in our agricultural papers, and by our experts. I thank God that all over the country we are not wasting the natural resources of the soil as we did when corn was burned for fuel. We are improving all along the line now, and in no section is the improvement more noticeable than in the South.

I was born in North Carolina, and when 4 years old, in the arms of my mother, was moved over the mountains. The family went to the Wabash, and my good old mother never ceased mourning for the magnificent climate of North Carolina. My father, when a young man, helped to found a college down near Greensboro, N. C. A few years ago I accepted an invitation to attend its commencement. I arrived the day before the commencement, and I went around with Prof. Hobbs through the section of country in the vicinity of Greensboro.

PROSPERITY RETURNS TO THE SOUTH.

I visited the old farm where I was born, and found there every evidence of prosperity and thrift. As I remembered the place, it was crossed by deep gullies and was not good for very much. I asked the farmer how he got the land into such a prosperous state. He replied that he began by throwing a dam across each gully, so that the dirt washed in and leveled up the land. Then he had found the use of clover and cowpeas and improved the land, and that while he had paid only \$10 an acre for it a few years before, he had within a few days refused \$25 per acre. I asked if any other agency were at work in bringing about this increase than his own labor and intelligence. "Oh, yes," said he, "we have railroads and factories now. Over here at Greensboro they have large factories, and I find there a market for my chickens and eggs and all the small fruit I have to sell."

I was amazed at the evidences of progress on every side, and if I had been taken into Greensboro blindfolded I would have remarked, "How marvelously has the city of Peoria, or the city of Quincy, improved."

So that renaissance in agriculture is not only going on in New York and in New England, but is going on in the South. The quickening life of other industries furnishes a market.

I went out to the old Quaker graveyard and even there I could trace the progress of that country. The first little monuments were 2 or 3 feet high, but gradually higher ones were added, until the monuments of the last 8 or 10 years compare favorably with those erected in any prosperous community. The graveyard told the story.

I am interested in seeing North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, all the Southern States, diversify their industries and restore their lands.

With our enterprising people, the most enterprising in the history of the human race, the Mississippi Valley bottom lands will discount a dozen Niles in Egypt in production. I am anxious to see them reclaimed, and by the aid and cooperation of our 92,000,000 of people, as the Federal Government performs its function, the rivers tributary to the Mississippi will be made good outlets for the tile, and when that land is drained it is the best land on earth.

I want to ask—and I would like to have an answer from any gentleman on the other side from the Southland—Is it not true that in the last 10 years, certainly in the last 20 years, the value of your lands, improved and unimproved, has doubled and been multiplied by three? "Oh, well," you say, "we raise cotton down there, and we have a monopoly of that production."

But do you know that last year, with a bumper crop of corn, aggregating three thousand million bushels in the United States, you raised in the Southland, in addition to your valuable cotton crop, one-third of that great corn crop—a thousand millions of bushels?

You may say, "The wheat farmers over in Canada with their cheap lands do not bother us." I will show you in a moment. Counting Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, the Southland produced almost one-third of the magnificent wheat crop of 1910. I will insert the actual figures later. If you did not raise a bushel of corn or a bushel of wheat or a bushel of oats or a bushel of barley or a bushel of potatoes, Irish or sweet, you would be interested. If you did not raise anything but cotton you would be interested, just as much as we of the Northland who do not raise cotton and who are liberal customers of yours, as you would be liberal customers of ours under the same circumstances. The South is growing more and more able to live within itself, and as she grows more and more able to do that her income will be greater and greater, and your fellow citizens all over the country will get their share as you get yours of the general prosperity.

Just here I want to call the attention of the honorable Speaker of the House to the interest the farmers of Missouri have in this bill. Missouri is a banner agricultural State. Her production of hay, oats, corn, barley, and fruits is enormous. In 10 years the value of Missouri farm lands has been more than doubled, and in 1910 that State produced more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I desire to inquire of my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], who made a speech yesterday, what he will say to the people of Oklahoma, in whose growth and progress we all take pride, and which also produced in 1910 more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat, when they complain that you have brought in competition with their products the almost illimitable production of Canada?

OUR OWN CITIZENS MUST DEFEND THE FLAG.

Recollect, if there is war, every citizen of the United States is called upon to defend the Republic. If there are school houses to build, if there are colleges to found, if there are railroads to maintain, if there are factories to construct, if labor is to be furnished, we can rely only on our own people. In the event of trouble, how much in taxes would Canada contribute for the preservation of the Republic? In the event of war, how many soldiers from Canada would fight the battles of the great Republic? How many of Canada's people would contribute to education in the United States? The college professors flourish and expound their delightful theories: "All mankind are brothers; all men are equal." Very good generalities, but all men are not equal from the intellectual standpoint. Some men are born simple-minded, some go to the insane asylum, some are weak, some are strong, some are wise, and some are wiser.

Mr. MURDOCK. And otherwise. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and otherwise. I am reminded that I have spoken an hour. I must hurry along, because there are several other matters I want to talk about.

Gentlemen, there come times in the history of a generation when those who have had the kindergarten instruction are in the minority. To the young who come in you may theorize and preach, but they know better, and 5 per cent of them—a percentage that holding the balance of power work a political revolution, five off one side and five on the other—have to learn through their stomachs what they do not learn through their heads. [Laughter.] This is true sometimes, not only of men in the shops, on the farm, and on the railways, but of men in office, and I have known it to be true of Members of Congress. [Laughter.] It is not a theory, whether it is your doxy or my doxy, that I care about, but facts. What will this bill do to us or for us?

It is 3,700 miles across Canada from ocean to ocean. Eight millions of people occupy that land, while we have 92,000,000. The countries were settled about the same time. The people of Canada are good people. We have had lots of them come to this country, and they have made good citizens. They came because it was for their interest to come. Now they have waked up. Great Britain is a wise country, a far-reaching country. The sun never sets on her possessions. Far away India, the Straits Settlements, Africa, Asia, Europe, North America—all in greater or less degree are under the magic wand of that great people. They are our brothers, our uncles, our fathers, and grandfathers, and if anybody thinks the people of Canada are fools they are mistaken. What have they in railway development?

Here (indicating on a map) is the Hudson Bay; here is the 49th parallel of latitude, the boundary between Canada and the

United States. Canada has to-day, with 8,000,000 people, 24,000 miles of railway. We have 92,000,000 people, with a territory comparatively well settled, and we have 240,000 miles of railway. It is said our lands have been taken up, but there are large areas of public land in western Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Washington, and all over that great western country which, with improved agriculture and with better farming, all things considered, would make the best lands in the world.

It is said there is no danger from a free market with Canada so far as our wheat is concerned. Let us see about that. The President in his message says practically that this bill will eventually reduce the cost of living and will not reduce the price of the farmer's products in the United States. Our President is a great man and I have great respect for him. I voted for him, and I apprehend that I will vote for him again. I am not here to abuse him, but I would like to see him demonstrate the proposition that it will not impair the farmer's prices and yet will still reduce the cost of living. [Laughter and applause.]

CANADIAN RAILWAY DEVELOPMENT BY SUBSIDIES.

The Canadian Pacific Railroad stretches across the country to Vancouver, with substantially 10,000 miles in Canada and 4,000 miles in the United States. The 24,000 miles of railway built in Canada have received over \$300,000,000 in aid from that Government and 55,000,000 acres of the best cereal producing land, excluding corn, on earth. The stock of the Canadian Pacific, as I recall, amounts to \$1,300,000,000. My friend from New York says that is too high, that that is the amount of the stock of all the Canadian railroads. However, its stock yesterday, I believe—a 10 per cent stock, was quoted at 224 or 225. The stock of the Union Pacific Railroad, one of the best equipped railroads on earth, is a 10 per cent stock and has never defaulted, but it is quoted at about 170.

The Canadian Pacific has also great steamship lines aided by the Canadian Government to the extent of a million and a half dollars bounty annually, and those steamship lines reach Japan, Hongkong, Australia, and San Francisco, and run down the South American coast and across the ocean to Liverpool.

Then comes the Grand Trunk, running from Quebec and Montreal to Winnipeg, branching out with three or four lines and running up here [indicating on map] from Manitoba, through the two great Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I understand it is also extending its line by Government aid to the Pacific coast, and that the extensions are soon to be completed. Already there is another great transcontinental system, the Canada Northern, being constructed by Government aid. It is connecting up the smaller roads that have been constructed, touches Winnipeg, and will have a terminus on the Pacific coast at a point not yet determined upon, but in the vicinity of Prince Rupert. Already it has, if I remember aright, over 2,500 miles constructed, and I read in the New York Sun that it has contracted for the construction, I believe, of four or five hundred miles this year. So that all things considered, the railroad development in Canada is simply wonderful. What good are the railroads going to do? Why do they build them? To aid in the settlement and development of a vast territory capable of producing vast quantities of grain.

I speak of the President respectfully, because I entertain the highest respect for him, but if he makes a mistake touching a policy or recommendation it does not absolve me. I have a warrant from the people—not as many as he has a warrant from, but from the people that I represent in my vote here, and when I vote my vote affects also the people of New Jersey and Florida and all the country, and I must follow my own judgment. I have done so in the past, and, God helping me, I will in the future after investigation follow my judgment, whatever Presidents may recommend. [Applause.] His duty is to veto or approve my action when it reaches him, not to dictate it. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am a Member of this body, and proud of it. I believe in it. It has its duty under the Constitution, and God helping me, whoever is President, and however the Senate is composed, while I hold official position I will walk in the shadow of my own judgment as God gives me to see the light, although I tread the path alone. [Applause.]

The President in his message congratulates the country on the making of the so-called reciprocity agreement, and says in effect that we have been aided greatly in developing the United States by immigration from Canada. He says further—I do not quote him literally—that it is well for our patriotic, wise, and experienced farmers to go over into the promised land and help in the development of Canada. Now, let us see about that. In the last two years, if I recollect right, about 300,000 American farmers went over into Canada. But it is said, "That is a new country; don't you know, Mr. CANNON, that

the people in the United States are to be greatly benefited by getting free wheat from that country," and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] says that the improved farms in Canada are worth as much as they are in New York, if I remember correctly.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman did not understand.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I will stand corrected.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman misunderstands a great many things.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, one thing at a time. I am not clothed with all wisdom; I do not have all kinds of statistical knowledge crowded into my head at all kinds of angles, and the power to defend the industries of Connecticut at one session, of Congress and attack the industries of the balance of the country at another. [Cheers and applause.]

WHEAT LANDS IN CANADIAN NORTHWEST.

Now, how much wheat did Canada produce in the year 1909? In round numbers, if I recollect right, 100,000,000 bushels. Where was it grown? All except about 10,000,000 bushels grown in eastern Canada was produced in Manitoba, in far-away Saskatchewan, in far-away Alberta, with a very little bit in British Columbia. That shows what that new country can do. How much of the land there is under cultivation? Under cultivation in these three Provinces last year there were less than 12,000,000 acres. What says the deputy minister of agriculture of the Province of Alberta? George Harcourt, deputy minister of agriculture for the Province of Alberta, in 1909, made this report:

Of the country which is known the area capable of producing grain is 220,000,000 acres. The total area in crops last year was 11,257,870 acres, producing a total crop of 240,000,000 bushels. The unoccupied land in the future will produce at least 5,000,000,000 bushels. This is not the end. There is a great northern country, the McKenzie Basin, which is capable of producing grain. (Canadian Yearbook.)

I cite the following as to wheat production in the United States and Canada, and the figures are taken from official Government reports:

Wheat statistics.

	Bushels.
Wheat produced in United States, 1910.....	691,707,000
Wheat exported.....bushels.....	24,257,392
Flour exported.....8,370,251 barrels=bushels.....	35,066,129
Wheat consumed in United States.....	631,843,470
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909.....	100,744,000
Wheat exported.....bushels.....	40,000,000
Flour exported.....1,000,000 barrels=bushels.....	4,500,000
Wheat consumed in Canada.....	113,244,000
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909.....	100,744,000
Wheat produced in Manitoba.....bushels.....	52,706,000
Wheat produced in Saskatchewan.....do.....	35,197,000
Wheat produced in Alberta.....do.....	3,579,000
	147,482,000

Wheat produced in remainder of Canada..... 19,262,000

The three Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced this yield of wheat with less than 12,000,000 acres under cultivation. They have an available area suited to the cultivation of wheat of 220,000,000 acres.

	Bushels.
Average yield of wheat per acre, Canada, 1909.....	21½
Average yield of wheat per acre, United States, 1909.....	15½

Wheat statistics, 1910.

[Crop Reporter, Department of Agriculture, 1910.]

	Bushels.
Minnesota.....	94,080,000
North Dakota.....	36,105,000
South Dakota.....	46,720,000
Washington.....	25,603,000
Oregon.....	16,413,000
Idaho.....	12,603,000
Montana.....	10,470,000
Total.....	241,994,000

Wheat produced in Southern States (including Kansas and Oklahoma).

	Bushels.
Maryland.....	13,816,000
Virginia.....	10,176,000
West Virginia.....	5,125,000
North Carolina.....	7,433,000
South Carolina.....	4,983,000
Georgia.....	2,730,000
Missouri.....	25,130,000
Kentucky.....	9,600,000
Kansas.....	62,068,000
Tennessee.....	10,647,000
Alabama.....	1,560,000
Mississippi.....	78,000
Texas.....	18,780,000
Oklahoma.....	25,363,000
Arkansas.....	2,710,000
New Mexico.....	860,000
Arizona.....	379,000
Total.....	201,438,000

AMERICAN FARMERS GO TO CANADA.

But some one says, "Mr. CANNON, our improved lands are substantially the same price as Canadian improved land." Granted. The price of improved lands in the farming districts of New York is substantially the same, as I understand, as those in Ontario, and perhaps the price of land in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire is substantially the same as the price of land in Quebec and perhaps in Nova Scotia. I am only approximating; but let us see. When you lose an industrious farmer who understands the science of farming, with his wife and his children, you lose more than money. [Applause on the Republican side.] A few days ago Mr. Earling, manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad and brother of its president, did me the honor to call on me to pay his respects. I was glad to see him. I asked, "Are you carrying lots of home seekers on that great road of yours?" He replied, "A good many." I inquired, "Where are they going—to the Dakotas and on to Montana and Washington?" "No," he replied, "we are carrying more than we ever carried, but we are only carrying them as far as Minneapolis." I asked him why they stopped at Minneapolis, and he answered, "They transship for Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta." One-half, two-thirds—yes; more than that—of the 200,000,000 acres of land in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta—and a great portion of them are as good as the sun ever shone upon—may be homesteaded, and if a man lives on the homestead for a year and turns over the sod on 30 acres, he takes title in fee. Then he can buy an adjacent quarter section, if it has not yet been taken up, at the Government price. In addition, there is much of the 55,000,000 acres of land granted by the Government to the railways which is subject to settlement on favorable terms. And yet Liverpool fixes the price of our grain say my friends who agree with the President, and all this will not make any difference in the price!

Now let us inquire about that. The freight rate on wheat from Winnipeg to Liverpool is less than it is from Minneapolis to Liverpool. I have made inquiry about this, and I speak by the book. Will some gentleman be kind enough to explain to me in his own time why it is, under such circumstances, that the price of wheat, equal in quality, as shown by the report of the Tariff Board called for by a resolution of the Senate, averages from 10 to 12 cents more per bushel the year round in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg? Last year the magnificent crop of wheat in the United States, amounting to nearly 700,000,000 bushels, was all consumed in the United States except about 60,000,000 bushels.

What was the per capita consumption of wheat in the United States last year? Nearly 7 bushels. What a contrast that is to the condition in 1894. In that year, in spite of a good crop of wheat in the United States, conditions were bad. I am not stating why they were bad; I am not seeking to play politics by referring to what happened while the Democratic Party had full possession of the Government; but I call attention to it in order to illustrate the point. In the four years from 1893 to 1897 there was a minimum of consumption of wheat—not more than about 4 bushels to each inhabitant. If I recollect aright, for one year, 1894, it was less than 3½ bushels. In that year of lowest per capita consumption the price of wheat was the lowest we have had in 50 years—less than 50 cents a bushel to the farmer. What was the reason? Who buys the wheat after the farmer consumes his share? The other two-thirds of the people in the United States. A falling off in the consumption of wheat at the rate of 1 bushel to each inhabitant in the United States represents a loss of 92,000,000 bushels. Last year we had a great crop, and more than six-sevenths of it was consumed here. Less than 70,000,000 bushels of it went abroad.

Between 6 and 7 bushels per capita was retained in this country for consumption. Why? Because our people—the men on the railroads, the men in the factories, and in other branches—were fairly well employed. They received increased wages. There was a great cry raised by politicians, by the college professors, and others as to the high cost of living; and yet two-thirds of the people, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, earned sufficient wages to consume 6½ bushels of wheat to each man, woman, and child, and they had the wherewith to pay for it. In the four years from 1893 to 1897 the average consumption was a little less than 4 bushels per capita. Why? Hundreds of thousands of men were tramping; three or four millions of men were out of employment, or on short employment.

FARM PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS DECLINE.

Let us pursue that policy whereby we adjust our production so that it is consumed substantially in the United States. Let us do as other nations do, and pursue that policy which is for our best interest. When a man says to me that Liverpool fixes

the price of grain for this crop of over 600,000,000 bushels of wheat, five-sixths of which is consumed in the United States, I say to him that I will believe him when he shows me that the tail wags the dog. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Since the election on the 8th day of November last, when our Democratic friends succeeded in carrying the House of Representatives by a majority of over 60, the farm price of agricultural products in the United States has decreased more than 25 per cent. The value of the product of labor and effort in other lines of industry, however, has not depreciated since that event. The wages of the employee in the factory, on the railroad, and in the mine have not been reduced, and I hope they will not be, although I could wish that there were a surer foundation for the hope than at present exists.

The cost of food products to the ultimate consumer, after they have passed through the hands of those who distribute, has not decreased in any commensurate proportion to the decrease in the farm price of agricultural products; in fact, prices at retail are almost as high, considering the season, as they were last November.

The farmer is not to blame for this condition. Although the farm value of his products has decreased over one-fourth, there have been no strikes on the part of the farmer. He is patient, patriotic, loyal, and is willing to bear his share of losses which come under the natural laws of trade. He is willing to submit to that law which should regulate all commerce in the United States, namely, the regulation of price by the supply and the demand.

I ask the question, What would have happened in the United States if the compensation of those who employ labor had been reduced one-fourth and if the wages of labor on railway, in factory, and in other industries had been cut in proportion? All over the country men now employed would be idle. There would be strikes, disorder, and panic, involving bankers, merchants, and the whole body politic.

Notwithstanding all this, the Democratic Party, with their enormous majority in the House, will pass this miscalled reciprocity bill, which will result in prosperity for our Canadian neighbors and bankruptcy for those engaged in agriculture in the United States.

This result may not come in a day, a week, or a month, but if this bill is enacted into law so long as it remains upon the statute book the situation will grow more and more acute, and while the burden will rest primarily upon those engaged in agriculture, no man lives to himself alone. Whatever injuriously affects the one-third of our population engaged in agriculture must inevitably react on and injure the other two-thirds. When the ability of the one-third to purchase the products of the other two-thirds is impaired, there must necessarily be a halting and slackening of production in all lines of industry, and we will have widespread panic and bankruptcy.

Some one says the northern railroads want this bill. Yes; some of them do; in fact, many of them do. One of the greatest men, in my judgment, in the United States, Mr. James J. Hill, a great railroad and empire builder, for whom I have the highest respect, heartily advocates this bill. He has builded a great railroad system from the Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, running near our northern boundary. I would rather agree with James J. Hill, Democrat as he is, than to disagree with him; but in my opinion the man is worse than an infidel who cares not for his own household. [Applause on the Republican side.] Here [indicating] is his railroad running up near the Canadian line, and you can count, as I have counted—and I think I have counted correctly—20 branch lines or spurs reaching over into this "poor" country of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan, and of Alberta. How poor that country is! Why, the eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], for whom I have great respect, in his speech made me wonder why there was so much fuss made about this proposed reciprocity agreement, for he seemed to prove, satisfactorily to himself at any rate, that this land would wear out in his lifetime or mine. Well, we have the reports in regard to it, and they show that it has a magnificent subsoil.

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS FAVORABLE TO WHEAT.

I went to the Weather Bureau to ascertain about the climate in these Provinces. I told them that I had read about the Japan current, that I had read about the long hours of sunshine during the crop season in northern Canada, and that I wanted to know about it. I asked them to make me a map, and after a week they sent me this one [indicating]. These red lines [indicating] are the heat lines. This one [indicating] starts away down here, not a great way from the central part of northern New York, and runs away up almost to 54° 40'. These lines indicate that they have as much heat in Canada during the crop season, and more, than in North Dakota. These

other lines indicate precipitation. I think I have asked the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA] more questions, perhaps, than anybody else in regard to this matter in my effort to learn about the section of the country in which he lives.

As I have said, the crop season is from April to August. I asked him, "How about the wheat lands up there?" "Why," said he, "they are all right." "Well," said I, "don't you get nipped with the frost?" He said, "Florida had her orange groves frozen a few years ago; you lost a wheat crop within your own recollection in Illinois and Iowa; you had the great corn crop in 1863 or 1864 absolutely killed before the middle of August. You have got to run those risks everywhere in the Temperate Zone, north or south."

Now, last year there was not enough moisture in North Dakota, and the crop was short about 5 bushels to the acre—the gentleman from North Dakota will correct me if my statement is inaccurate—but in Alberta, here, and in Saskatchewan, a little to the north, I think they raised in the neighborhood of 20 bushels to the acre. They had a little more moisture there. The dews were heavier. Farther north they had a little more sunshine. After the closest study I have been able to give the matter I have no hesitation in saying that in these three Provinces, without going into the McKenzie Basin, here [indicating], which reaches away up to the sixtieth degree of latitude and above, tempered by the current that comes from the Pacific Ocean and by the winds that down in the State of Washington are called the chinook winds, with the Rocky Mountains lower, with the Coast Range almost obliterated—I say to you there is as much moisture during the crop season throughout all this country here, up to Prince Rupert, including British Columbia, as there is in North Dakota; as much as there is in South Dakota and northern Michigan; and as much as at Port Arthur, in the magnificent Province of Ontario, which reaches down like a wedge between New York on one side and Michigan on the other.

The average temperature at Edmonton, 325 miles north of the border line between Canada and the United States, is the same as at Kalispel, Mont., and Port Arthur on Lake Superior.

Calgary, 150 miles north of the border line, has the same average mean temperature as Duluth, Minn., Alpena, Mich., Devils Lake, N. Dak., Cheyenne, Wyo., and Denver, Colo.

There is more rainfall in the crop season 100 miles north of Edmonton than in any part of the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, or northern North Dakota, and Minnesota, and the same rainfall as in North and South Dakota.

Calgary has the same precipitation as the northwestern part of the United States.

WE SHOULD CARE FOR OUR OWN.

Now, it is up to us to say whether we will care for our own. Will we continue to develop our own country from east to west and from north to south, or will we, without one iota of compensation, throw open our markets to all the agricultural products of the rapidly developing country in Canada?

Nations care for their own. These 92,000,000 of people of ours not only have to be strong enough, but wise enough, to face the world and pursue that policy that is the best for them.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts and New England that in the last 10 years hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to the value of your farm lands—enough to make up for the loss sustained prior to 1900, while we were developing the great West.

New York and New England had 7,200,000 acres of agricultural lands abandoned between 1880 and 1900. There was a reduction of \$260,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same States in the same period.

Ohio also lost \$91,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same time.

Illinois increased the value of farm lands and buildings in the same time \$756,000,000.

The losses in the East have been recovered in the last 10 years.

New England increased the value of farm lands and buildings \$183,000,000 since 1900.

Connecticut had a loss of \$24,000,000 in such values from 1880 to 1900 and a gain of \$39,000,000 from 1900 to 1910.

Maine had a loss of \$6,500,000 in such values from 1880 to 1900 and a gain of \$61,000,000 in the last 10 years.

Vermont's loss for the 20 years prior to 1900 was \$23,000,000, and her gain since that year \$29,000,000.

New Hampshire lost \$5,500,000 from 1880 to 1900 and gained \$15,500,000 in the last 10 years.

Massachusetts lost \$19,000,000 in the value of farm lands and farm buildings between 1880 and 1890 and gained \$54,000,000 in the same values in the last 20 years, \$33,000,000 of that increase being credited to the last 10 years.

Rhode Island lost \$2,000,000 in similar values from 1880 to 1900, and gained \$4,000,000 from 1900 to 1910.

The losses in value on farm lands and farm buildings from 1880 to 1900 in New England alone amounted to \$83,000,000, and the gains in the same section in the last 10 years amounted to \$183,000,000.

New York's farm lands, and farm buildings were worth \$168,000,000 less in 1900 than in 1880 and \$288,000,000 more in 1910 than in 1900.

The Empire State in the last 10 years recovered her losses of the preceding 20 years and added \$120,000,000 as a net gain over the values she had in 1880, when her farms began to decline.

The average value of farm lands per acre increased in the last 10 years as follows:

	Per cent.
Maine	75
Massachusetts	32
Vermont	30
Connecticut	43
Rhode Island	17
New Hampshire	40
New York	31
Pennsylvania	14
Illinois	106
Indiana	94
Iowa	120
Michigan	33
Minnesota	76
Missouri	104

So I say that the renaissance in agriculture has come to the East as well as the West, and by this legislation you propose to check that return of the American farmer to his old-time prosperity.

HARRISON AND BLAINE ON RECIPROCITY.

There has never been a time when Canada was not earnestly knocking at the doors of the United States for the admission, without tax or tariff, of her agricultural products. I do not care whether you call it reciprocity or free gift. Gentlemen will recall the treaty of 1854 and its subsequent repeal. I will not go back to that; that is behind us. In 1892 Canada, through the British minister, asked the administration of Benjamin Harrison, Blaine being Secretary of State, to receive delegates from Canada to cooperate with the British minister in making a reciprocity agreement. They came. Harrison tells it in a few words:

Here is what President Harrison said in his last message, December 6, 1892:

During the past year a suggestion was received through the British minister that the Canadian Government would like to confer as to the possibility of enlarging upon terms of mutual advantage the commercial exchanges of Canada and the United States, and a conference was held at Washington, with Mr. Blaine acting for this Government and the British minister at this capital and three members of the Dominion cabinet acting as commissioners on the part of Great Britain.

The conference developed the fact that the Canadian Government was only prepared to offer to the United States in exchange for the concessions asked the admission of natural products. The statement was frankly made that favored rates could not be given to the United States as against the mother country. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

Now, what is a natural product? Oh, the air, the ocean, the mountains, the coal in the ground, the forest, the soil, the iron ore in the ground, the limestone for the flux, the clay for the brick. But when the coal becomes coke, when the clay becomes fire brick, are these products natural products? No; because the mining of the coal requires labor; the coking of the coal requires labor. The man who digs the fire clay puts into it his labor; the man who mines the iron ore contributes his labor. Wherever the hand of man makes matter assume a shape that is useful to the human family, when it leaves his hand it has ceased to be a natural product and has become a finished product. [Applause on the Republican side.] What temerity to call a product a natural product after it has been touched by the hand of labor! I believe this bill is greatly in the interest of Canada, without compensating benefit to the United States. In support of that view I want to quote from the report of the proceedings in the Canadian House of Commons. They have the English system in Canada, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been, I believe, prime minister for 16 years. He is a man of great ability and a candid man.

PREMIER LAURIER SAYS IT BENEFITS CANADA.

In addressing the Canadian House of Commons on March 7 on this proposed, miscalled reciprocity agreement, amongst other things Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

We—

Referring to Canada—

are, above all, an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. What are they? Fruits,

cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—not an idle boast, but a boast founded on actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruit we can, without exaggeration, beat the world.

Will you accept Mr. Laurier as a proper witness? Again, he says:

All that we ask under these resolutions is to obtain for the man who works in the field the best possible remuneration for his labor.

And then he compliments the minister of finance, Mr. Fielding, and the minister of customs, Mr. Patterson, who negotiated in secret this agreement with our Secretary of State. If the people of the United States had been informed what they were up to, in my judgment, their indignation would have thundered throughout the country until no Secretary of State would have dared make the agreement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Sir Wilfrid Laurier thanks these two men for having obtained from the United States such an advantageous arrangement, and having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Again, Sir Wilfrid Laurier says:

I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, that is the statement of the man who is responsible for the Canadian Government. The man responsible in an executive capacity for our Government says: "No; Sir Wilfrid, you are wrong."

Again Mr. Laurier says, and I want your attention to this:

Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the exchange embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and therefore if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise in Great Britain, there is a ready market in the United States.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Again, the Canadian premier says:

We are exporters not of manufactured products, but of natural products, and we are large importers of manufactured products; and we have given to the Americans a free entrance to our markets only for their natural products, as they have given us a free entrance to their market for our natural products.

Again, he says:

It is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products; but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

Mr. Laurier is a remarkably candid and square man. He wants this legislation for the protection and benefit of the agriculturists in Canada. I am against it, because I believe it will work grave injury to the one-third of our people engaged in agriculture and inevitably to all our people, because if the agriculturist does not prosper, if his lands are sold for taxes, if his numbers decrease, if his production falls off, if he becomes a starvation consumer for the factories in Connecticut and in Massachusetts that weave the clothing, the whole people are bound to suffer.

STEEL TRUST FAVORS THE AGREEMENT.

Now I want to refer to one or two other matters. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] represents that great district in which Birmingham is situated, where God Almighty, when he threw matter into space, placed side by side the iron ore and the limestone and the coal. It is said that the great United States Steel Corporation—and I have no abuse for it as long as it performs its functions for the benefit of all the people—has so large an interest in the district which my friend represents that it is very desirous that this bill should pass. My information is accurate, for I have it in black and white from a man who ought to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not in the confidence of the United States Steel Corporation. They do own about one-third of the iron ore in my district, a very valuable property. I am satisfied the gentleman from Illinois can inform the House as to its plan of procedure better than I can. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. After all, that is gratuitous. I did not speak of the gentleman personally in connection with this matter, I spoke of the factors in his district, which is being so magnificently developed. I want to say that if he could construe what I said into a reflection on him personally, it seems to me he would have to strain the construction.

Now, I will look my friend in the eye and say that I never, directly or indirectly, had any interest in the United States Steel Corporation, nor did any relative of mine. That great corporation may or may not be violating the law. If it is, let it be prosecuted. But, as it is a great corporation, and as I have, as I think, been reliably informed that it believes this agreement ought to be ratified, I made that statement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In what I said I intended to make no reflection on the gentleman's personality, but merely meant to imply that the gentleman, speaking from the standpoint of the Republican Party, must of necessity be very much closer to the Steel Corporation than I was, speaking from the standpoint of the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. That is the case with all industries.

Mr. CANNON. I am proud of all the industries in this great Republic—the railroads, the factories, and the furnaces. I am proud, also, of the great development brought about by that great organization the Standard Oil Co., no member of which I have any personal knowledge of directly or indirectly. Its fleets are upon every ocean. Its production is magnificent. It reaches with its pipe lines into the districts represented by my colleague, Dr. FOSTER, and myself. Our constituents, Doctor, were exceedingly anxious to get them to construct their pipe lines, and now that they have got them, I fancy that, while some of our constituents are very anxious to damn them, they would not have them turned out. [Laughter.] The American people have worked and are working out their own salvation.

THE FREE-LIST BILLS OF 1894.

Now, then, one word more. I hold in my hand the bill reported, as I understand, this morning by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], placing on the free list agricultural implements and various other articles. Already in the Payne law, which has been so cursed and damned, any country can have free trade with us in agricultural implements provided it grants a like concession to us. You now propose to go further. You say to Great Britain, and you say to every foreign manufacturer of agricultural implements, come in without price and enjoy the markets of 90,000,000 of people without yielding anything in return. Canada levies, I believe, a tariff of from 12½ per cent to 20 per cent on agricultural implements.

This is not the first time the Democrats have passed popgun tariff bills through the House. I was here when the Wilson law was passed. I saw the virile Democratic majority run the steam roller over the minority, and agree en bloc to 600 Senate amendments without dotting an i or crossing a t. That was pretty bad. Cleveland said the bill was a measure of perfidy and dishonor, and he let the bill become a law without signing it. But it became a law all the same, and the present honored Speaker of the House [Mr. CLARK] spoke and voted for it. Then what happened? The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Springer, a Democratic Member, rose in his place and offered a popgun bill, putting iron ore on the free list. They just rushed it through by the aid of the steam roller. Then, I think, bills placing coal and several other articles on the free list were passed in the same way. The Democrats in the House said, "We will show the people that we are willing to make a free list." They thought that was fine politics. We were just entering upon the campaign in the fall of 1894, and after that election the Republican Party came back into the House with a majority of something like 120. Oh, yes; you passed the Wilson bill as you propose to pass the reciprocity bill—without amendment—and you passed popgun bills putting numerous articles on the free list, just as you propose to do now. When I was a boy I read about that wonderful bird, the ostrich, with its small head and great body, and when it wanted to hide it stuck its head in the sand. I used to wonder how that ostrich looked. I saw how it looked when you passed those bills. [Laughter.] History repeats itself.

Pass your popgun bills through, but they will not, in my judgment, serve you any better than similar bills served your ostrich brethren in 1894.

"Oh," it is said, "we must pass this bill as it is, because if it is amended Canada won't have it." Who is legislating for the United States—we or Canada? [Applause on the Republican side.] A treaty made under the auspices of Great Britain, between Canada and France, was hung up in the French Senate for months. It was said that it must not be amended or Canada would not have it; but the French amended it, and provided that fattened cattle coming into France on the hoof should not come in under the minimum tariff, but should pay the maximum tax. They amended it from the standpoint of the interest of the people of France.

The treaty went back to Canada. The negotiations were ended if Canada did not accept the amendment. Canada did

accept the amendment. Canada has not yet acted upon this measure. Would it not be well enough to let Canada speak for herself? Gentlemen, you may pass this bill, and if it is enacted into law and disaster comes on account of it, the American sovereign, as you will find out, has a keen eye and a long recollection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It has been stated that the adoption of the reciprocity agreement will increase our trade with Canada. On evidence that would be strong enough to impel me to act upon matters of great importance to myself or my country, I say that is not its object at all. Have you noticed the figures of our imports into Canada?

CAN WE IMPROVE OUR TRADE WITH CANADA?

To those who urge that the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement will expand our trade with Canada and widen the market in that country for American production, let me quote from the Canada Yearbook for 1909 the figures of imports.

In 1909 the total imports into Canada were \$309,756,008. Of this amount, \$192,661,360 came from the United States; \$86,257,557 from the British Empire, including Newfoundland; and \$30,837,091 from all other foreign countries. In other words, the United States sent into Canada in the year 1909 \$75,586,112 more in products than all the rest of the world, including Great Britain and the British possessions.

As showing the growth of the trade of the United States with Canada, the percentages furnished by the Canada Yearbook are even more illuminating, showing, as they do, that the United States has gradually, year by year, increased its trade with Canada until in the year 1909 59 per cent of the total imports into Canada came from the United States.

In 1868, when the Dominion Government was organized, the percentage of imports from Great Britain into Canada subject to duty was 64.78 of the total imports subject to duty; and the percentage of imports which came in free was 39.82 of the total imports which came in free. In the same year the percentage of imports from Great Britain and the British possessions dutiable and free to the total imports dutiable and free was 56.06.

The percentage of imports from the United States to Canada for the same year subject to duty was 22.93 of the total imports subject to duty, and the percentage of imports from the United States which came in free was 53.96 of the total imports which were admitted into Canada without payment of duty. The percentage of all imports from the United States dutiable and free to the total imports dutiable and free was 33.77.

Since the year 1868 the proportion of imports from Great Britain to Canada to imports from the United States has steadily decreased until in 1909 Great Britain sent to Canada only 29.84 per cent of the total dutiable imports admitted to Canada, 16.31 per cent of the total imports admitted into Canada free of duty, and 24.52 per cent of the total imports of Canada.

The percentages of the United States, on the other hand, had increased, until in 1909 we sent to Canada 51.76 per cent of her total dutiable imports, 70.20 per cent of her total free imports, and 59 per cent of her total importation, dutiable and free.

The average for the 42-year period from 1868 to 1909 for the respective countries of Great Britain and the United States is as follows:

Imported from Great Britain.		Per cent.
Dutiable to total dutiable		41.24
Free to total free		22.39
Dutiable and free to all imports		34.49
Imported from the United States.		Per cent.
Dutiable to total dutiable		43.15
Free to total free		65.75
Dutiable and free to all imports		51.24

It is interesting and instructive to note the average ad valorem rate of duty paid by American imports into Canada in comparison with the average on imports into Canada from Great Britain and other countries. In spite of the Canadian preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain, the figures show that the lowest average ad valorem rate is paid by imports from the United States. I quote the following figures taken from the Canada Yearbook, 1909 (p. 225):

	Per cent.
Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports into Canada from Great Britain, 1909	25.755
Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports into Canada from the United States, 1909	24.868
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from Great Britain, 1909	10.028
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from the United States, 1909	13.247
Average ad valorem on dutiable imports into Canada from all countries, 1909	27.315
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from all countries, 1909	16.586

When Canada wanted to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States in Harrison's administration they asked permis-

sion that they might come to Washington and treat. The pending agreement was initiated upon our invitation, not upon theirs, and it is the first instance of the kind in the history of the country.

FREE PRINT PAPER THE ISSUE.

What are we to gain by such an agreement? We have the lion's share of trade with Canada, and at a less ad valorem than any other country on earth. Why did this invitation go? What was there that caused this agreement to be initiated without the Secretary of State taking the American people into his confidence? Now, I am going to present the evidence to you, you being the jury. There has been a good deal of talk, running over several years, about the price of print paper. I have not been under the tongue of good report with the publishers of our metropolitan newspapers and magazines. I only refer to it to illustrate the situation. I have no feeling about the matter. It is behind us. The publishers can not now change it, nor can I.

The Committee on Ways and Means in the Sixtieth Congress was headed by Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McCALL, Mr. DALZELL, and others being members. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS introduced his free print-paper bill, and it went to that committee. As I am informed, the committee by a unanimous vote, including the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], then and now a member of that committee, postponed the bill for that session of Congress, and did not even hold hearings on it. I was Speaker. They unloaded on me. [Laughter and applause.] The minority in the House had inaugurated a filibuster that lasted to the end of the session. It was ably lead by Mr. WILLIAMS, now a Senator from Mississippi. We had a stormy time. Newspaper publishers, through their representatives, one of whom I will name, Mr. Herman Ridder, came to me, demanding that I should do something which had never been done, so far as I know, in the history of the Republic—that I should recognize some Member, JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS or some one else, on a Monday—suspension day—and move to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of that bill and pass it.

I said that I could not do that; that it would not be just to my party. I said, "This is no time, on the eve of a presidential election, to take such action, and by doing so, if I had any regard for my personal welfare, I would subject myself to legitimate criticism, lose the respect of the minority, receive the condemnation of the majority, and the disapproval of the country." [Applause.]

There was some nasty talk, to which I will not refer, and it is not necessary to do so; but I have been hammered from that time to this, though I believe they have let up on me now, inasmuch as I am no longer the Speaker, and I am enjoying a little season of rest. It is all right. I am 75 years old, and, whatever they do, when I appear at the gate of either of the places where men go hereafter [laughter], whether I go where they wear asbestos halos or those of muslin, I will walk with my head erect and say, "I retain my own self-respect." [Loud applause.]

I am not going far into the matter here. I am going to run over the personal part of it as rapidly as possible. Many things happened about that time, and threats were made that if the Republican Party did not promptly put print paper upon the free list that great and good man who headed the Publishers' Association, Mr. Herman Ridder, would support Mr. Bryan for the Presidency and contribute \$100,000 to his election.

We did not pass that bill, and when the time came Mr. Ridder was made treasurer of the Democratic national committee, and I guess he gave you boys on the Democratic side \$50,000, did he not? [Laughter.] The newspapers say so, and I have never seen it denied. So much for that.

COST OF PRODUCTION HERE AND IN CANADA.

I recollect very well that under the hot attack upon myself personally, and upon the party of which I was a member, I looked about for some means of defense, and I introduced a resolution creating a special committee to investigate the condition as to print paper. When the resolution was agreed to, I appointed that committee, and my honorable colleague [Mr. MANN] was made chairman. The House will recall the high personnel of that committee, and will agree that it worked industriously. But from one end of the country to the other I was criticized for that action by resolutions passed by the Publishers' Association and by denunciations in the newspapers. The committee made an honest investigation, and in the fullness of time they submitted a report. They found that there was a difference of \$2 a ton between the cost of production in Canada and the cost of production in the United States. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I recall, stated, if not in the report, on the floor of the House, that that was as near

as they could get it to the actual difference. It was a unanimous report, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the other Democrat on the committee concurring.

This House in the consideration of the Payne tariff bill accepted the recommendation of the Mann special committee and fixed the duty on print paper at \$2. The bill went to the Senate, where there is no previous question. The Mann report was not accepted by that body, and they fixed the duty at \$4 a ton. In the compromise effected between the Senate and the House—and all legislation is a compromise—the rate was made \$3.75 a ton, a reduction from \$6, the rate under the Dingley law.

In this connection, allow me to call the attention of the House to the difference between the Tariff Board and the Mann special committee on this matter. The Mann committee reported that \$2 would represent the difference, whereas the Tariff Board said that \$4.14 represented the difference. (S. Doc. 849, 61st Cong., 3d sess.) In this bill you reject both reports and propose to let it in free.

I hold no power of attorney to defend the paper industry. I have not a constituent, so far as I know, who has an interest in it. If it be true that the difference in the cost of production of this material in Canada, or anywhere else on earth, and the United States is \$2 a ton or \$4 a ton, then that difference ought to measure the tariff rate. I say that because I am a protectionist. Beyond that I have no interest.

The New York World claims that there is \$798,000,000 capital invested in the printing trades, and admits that the product last year was valued at \$857,000,000. Is there any other industry in this country whose annual product is valued at more than its entire capital?

By the industrial census of 1905 there were \$385,000,000 capital invested in these trades, including books, newspapers, periodicals, etc., and the annual product was \$496,000,000. Three-fifths of the capital and product was credited to the newspapers and periodicals, as follows:

Capital.....	\$239,518,524
Salaries.....	47,128,711
Wages.....	59,830,768
Incidental expenses.....	67,638,099
Materials.....	70,358,000
Product.....	309,327,606

The combined cost of production, including salaries, wages, materials, incidental expenses, amounted to \$244,955,578. Subtracting this from the value of the product, \$309,327,606, leaves \$64,372,028, which is a trifle less than 27 per cent of the capital.

Patent medicines and women's clothing were the only other industries that equaled this percentage of profit on investment in that census.

By the census of 1905 it was also shown that nearly 60 per cent of the income of newspapers and periodicals, including country weeklies, came from advertising and little more than 40 per cent from subscriptions and sales.

It is claimed by the New York World that the product of the printing trade is now valued at \$857,000,000, or nearly double what it was five years ago, and it is admitted that the income from advertising yields a greater ratio of the whole income than it did it 1905.

ADVERTISING AND THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The advertising bill of this country is placed at more than \$500,000,000 a year. This is from the printing trade alone. Add to this the cost of electric and mechanical advertising, and it is estimated that we are spending between \$700,000,000 and \$800,000,000 a year for advertising—to induce the people to purchase.

So, my Democratic friends, advertising is one of the items in the high cost of living.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And it is on the free list. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; absolutely on the free list.

The total value of all farm property in 1900 was given at a little more than \$20,000,000,000, and it is now estimated at more than \$30,000,000,000, while the total value of all produce from the farms of the United States last year is given by the Secretary of Agriculture at a little less than \$9,000,000,000.

According to the figures given in the President's message, there was less than \$6,000,000 worth of wood pulp and print paper imported from Canada last year, and we are asked to open the doors and jeopardize the farmers' market for nearly \$9,000,000,000 worth of produce to enable the publishers to get less than \$6,000,000 worth of paper and pulp at a less cost than they have had to pay, when they are making 27 per cent on their invested capital.

This wood pulp and print paper is the one item in the agreement on which there is no reciprocity. Mr. Fielding, in his letter to Secretary Knox, made this perfectly clear. He said:

In the meantime the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain.

The Canadian duty on print paper is 15 per cent.

The six cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Boston, and Baltimore have one-half of the whole publishing business of the United States, and it is easy to account for the enthusiastic demands for the ratification of this agreement by the publishers of those great centers of population whether the dwellers in those cities are equally clamorous or not.

The proposed reciprocity agreement should be labeled "the publishers' pact," whereby agricultural products are traded off for the publishers' profits.

I have inquired to some extent as to the capital and profits of some of the great newspapers and magazines. I recollect I made inquiry about one—the only one, perhaps, that ever perpetrated a criminal libel upon me in all my public or private life. The one to which I refer was committed by a man named Higgins, who published Success. I had a lawyer friend who agonized with me to bring a criminal action and civil action against him for libel. So I caused an inquiry to be made, and the information came back that the concern and some of its stockholders were so insolvent that nothing would be found on execution to satisfy a judgment against them. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not hate the newspapers. I know many of their publishers, editors, and correspondents. I have the highest respect for them. The metropolitan newspapers and magazines have access to the people. In my last campaign I covered my district by automobile, taking my constituency into my confidence. They knew, after the years I had represented them and lived with them, that I would tell the truth. When I could not get the truth into the metropolitan newspapers, the country newspapers came to my rescue. God bless the country newspapers. [Applause.] They are a part of us. When we are married and given in marriage they tell the good news. They go to our weddings and our funerals. They rejoice with us when we rejoice and mourn with us when we mourn. [Applause.] One reason why I am against the parcels post is because it is in the interest of strangers. We know the local merchant and the commercial traveler. They belong to our churches and to our clubs. They help make our civilization; they are acquainted with our farmers and our farmers are acquainted with them; but we do not know the mail-order houses.

I do not know the men who own the enormous metropolitan papers. They have heard of me, but they do not seem to care much about me. [Laughter.] I am not complaining. I am not seeking justification. If they do not let me alone, I will not quit public life, if I get my way about it, until my constituency asks me to retire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHY THE PUBLISHERS WANT RECIPROCITY.

I have referred to Herman Ridder. A friend of mine who publishes a country newspaper sent me this:

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION,
WORLD BUILDING,
New York, March 15, 1911.

DEAR SIR: May I invite your attention to the point that promptness in ratifying the reciprocity agreement of the United States with Canada is of the utmost importance to newspapers?

There is danger in amendments, or changes, or delay.

[Laughter.]

The two Governments had a tacit understanding that the arrangement would go through as framed. The difficulties attending ratification on the Canadian side may be increased greatly if there is hesitation or an attempt on our part to make a new trade.

Will you kindly urge, through your publication and by letters to your Representative and Senators, that the agreement as made by the State Department be passed speedily by Congress and without amendment?

Yours, faithfully,

HERMAN RIDDER,
President American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I have another:

[Established 1844.]

CHICAGO DAILY JOURNAL,
Chicago, Ill., November 18, 1910.

This is dated before the making of the reciprocity agreement—

MY DEAR SIR:—

I want the Democratic Members to listen to this and see if they will not recognize this delightful letter. Stand up now and bear testimony—

I want you all to get up and sing "Renew my courage, Lord," and say whether you got this letter. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

MY DEAR SIR: The independent press—

This is one of the independent fellows. [Laughter.]—

The independent press of the country, and a large part of the Republican press, supported Democratic candidates this year because

Republican Senators and Representatives did not keep their word in regard to removing the tariff on paper.

In my opinion the way to insure the continued support of those publishers through the campaign of 1912 is to put all print paper, pulp, and all material entering into the manufacture of paper on the free list at the earliest possible moment, and to announce now that that will be the policy of Democrats in Congress.

Yours, truly,

JOHN C. EASTMAN.

Is there anybody on the other side of the House who did not get one of these letters? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If so, let him arise and say so. No one arises.

It does not make much difference to me what somebody said in the past or what somebody did in the past so long as they do not violate the law. What they said and did may sometimes be useful as an example and admonition, but it does not shed much light on the present or on the future. Yet there have been so many efforts to drag in the name of William McKinley, by whose side I sat for 16 years when he was an honored Member of this House, that I want to clear the matter up a little bit. Somebody has got to defend the dead.

MCKINLEY'S RECIPROCITY POLICY.

McKinley held to the Republican theory of reciprocity in non-competing products. In his opening speech on the McKinley bill in the House of Representatives, May 7, 1890, speaking of reciprocity, he said:

We have been beaten in every instance. From 1854 to 1860—12 years of reciprocity with Canada—we bought of them twice as much as they bought of us. Ninety-five per cent of their products came into the United States free of duty, while only 42 per cent of ours went into Canada free of duty. Mr. Chairman, what these other countries want is a free and open market with the United States. What we want, if we ever have reciprocity, must be reciprocity with equality, reciprocity that shall be fair, reciprocity that shall be just, reciprocity that shall give us our share in the trade or arrangement that we make with the other nations of the world.

It will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that wherever we have tried reciprocity or low duties we have always been the loser.

President McKinley did not advance upon any new ground in 1901. He said at Buffalo substantially what he had said in his first inaugural address March 4, 1897. Here is the reciprocity paragraph from his inaugural address, and I challenge anyone to find any other or different policy set forth in his Buffalo speech:

In the revision of the tariff especial attention should be given to the reenactment and extension of the reciprocity principle of the law of 1890, under which so great a stimulus was given to our foreign trade in new and advantageous markets for our surplus agricultural and manufactured products. The brief trial given this legislation amply justifies a further experiment and additional discretionary power in the making of commercial treaties, the end in view always to be the opening of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

That is just what President McKinley said in the beginning of his administration when he gave notice that he would call the Congress to meet in extraordinary session on March 15, 1897, to revise the tariff on protection lines, and it is substantially what he said in his last public utterance at Buffalo in September, 1901.

What did McKinley say at Buffalo? Here it is:

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. * * * We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industry and labor. * * * What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and production, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

McKinley's idea of reciprocity was to provide an outlet for our surplus production; the pending reciprocity measure is an attempt to cheapen our consumption.

McKinley sought to increase our exports; this proposes to increase our imports. The two schemes are radically different.

Oftentimes when McKinley's Buffalo speech is quoted the words "without harm to our industry and labor" are omitted. I indorse every word of that speech. It is in harmony with his official life and his action as a legislator. I have always been for that policy announced by McKinley and always expect to be for it.

I recollect that a great candidate for office in 1904 read that extract; but he left out the words "without harm to our industry and labor," so that it would read, "We should take from our customers such of our products as we could use." I had to meet that quotation frequently, and I could always meet it in a sentence. Gentlemen will recall the old story about the infidel and the preacher. The infidel said that he could prove by the preacher's own Bible that there was no God. "Show me," said the preacher. The infidel turned over and found one of the chapters which David is supposed to have written, and he said, "There it is." It read, "There is no God." But the parson

had read his Bible. He said, "You scoundrel, take your thumb off and read it all." And when he did so, it read, "The fool saith in his heart there is no God." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I had no idea I should talk so long. I am a Republican and a protectionist. I indorse the Republican policy announced in the Republican platform of 1908. I believe in it, and I will support it; but I beg gentlemen to recollect that there is nothing perfect that comes from the hand of man, and there never will be enacted a tariff bill satisfactory in every particular to any man. Perfection comes from God alone, who has all wisdom and all power.

I voted for the Payne-Aldrich bill. I agree with the President in what he said at Winona, that it is the best protective-tariff bill ever passed. I still believe that. If I had supreme power, I would wipe out some things in it. I could find duties here and there which might be lowered, and I want to tell the truth and say that I could find here and there an article on the dutiable list with a duty that is not protective, or an article on the free list which, if placed on the protective list, would have founded great industries.

HYSTERIA HALTS PRODUCTION.

Hysteria has been promoted by the great publishers. They can do a great deal in destroying parties and wiping out individuals, but they can not do as much as they could have done two years or four years ago. [Applause.] When this proposed agreement is vitalized by legislation, when you hold the country up with the threat of tariff revision, to get rid of the Payne law, which the President said—and I think, substantially, all on this side agree with him—was the best protective tariff bill ever passed, though not perfect, you make men fearful. The farmer buys 5 per cent or 10 per cent less; the man with a fixed income buys a little less; and the laborer on the railway or elsewhere buys a little less; and when you reduce by 5 per cent the capacity of our 92,000,000 people to consume, you close factories, you cut down wages, you beget strikes. You ought to recollect that, my Democratic friends. Some of you were living in 1894, and some of you were here; but there are many of you who have come in since who will have to learn by kindergarten instruction.

Now, I want to say to men on this side of the House that I am somewhat full of combativeness. Sometimes I seem to have temper when I have none, and sometimes I have temper when I think I am under unjust charge; but when matters are behind me, I say again, as I have said on a former occasion, there is nothing in animate nature that I would harm or punish. I never expect to agree with all of you, and most of you, perhaps, will not agree with opinions I may hold; but we must cooperate; we must stand together or hang separately. [Laughter.] We are in the minority. We are not responsible for legislation. The Democrats are responsible. Our office is criticism, and I think we are perfectly able to perform the duties of that office. [Laughter.]

I want to say to my New England friends, to my Missouri friends, to my Illinois friends, and to all men who share the Republican faith, that if the Republican Party is to live, it can live only by being true to and supporting the policy of protection, under which the men who live in the sweat of their faces, bearing the burdens of the most expensive civilization on earth, receive \$2, as compared with \$1 received by labor in other countries of the world; by equalizing production in our own country and keeping our own markets.

Gentlemen from Massachusetts, gentlemen from the Keystone State, the citadel of protection, the great State that through evil and good report has always kept the Republican faith, may hug to their breasts the delusion, on account of all that has been said as to the high cost of living, that they want you to vote for this measure; but, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, without regard to what others may think, God helping me, I will keep the Republican faith; and after the majority, substantially in solid phalanx, vitalizes this outrageous legislation, I would sooner take my chances in 1912 as an adherent of Republican doctrine.

To you gentlemen from Massachusetts I will say that I love Massachusetts. She has done more, perhaps, than any Commonwealth in the Union in shaping the sentiment and promoting the civilization of the people of the great Republic. Did you vote for Foss in the last election? Is he to represent the permanent public sentiment in Massachusetts? When the penalty is paid, as it will be paid between this and the year 1912, and consumption and production are restricted and decrease, are you still going to support him? Is he your leader? This bill might well be labeled, "A bill by the grace—or punishment—of God, the aid of the Secretary of State, and Foss, of Massachusetts, and the almost solid vote of Democratic Members." Choose ye! [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat I will ask him if he will permit a question?

LIVERPOOL DOES NOT FIX THE PRICE.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; if it is apt.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I have been very greatly interested and entertained by the remarkably able speech of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. Toward the close of it he said he was a protectionist and a Republican. I, too, am a protectionist and a Republican, and I wish to ask him this question, and to say before asking the question this, that I never as a Republican claimed that the price of wheat in the United States was not fixed in Liverpool. The gentleman entered into a very astute and very earnest argument to show that the price of wheat in the United States was not fixed in Liverpool. Does the gentleman entertain that view as a Republican?

Mr. CANNON. The price of wheat, I am satisfied, is fixed where the major part of the product is sold. [Applause.] Five-sixths of the wheat produced in the United States is sold to our own people in the United States. I will further answer the gentleman's question by asking another: Will the gentleman have the kindness to make things as plain by explaining why wheat of the same quality averages from 12 to 15 cents more in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg?

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one other question? I recalled, while the gentleman was speaking, that I heard the gentleman from Illinois say that the price of American wheat was fixed in Liverpool. I remembered that because it was my first term in Congress, and I found the

RECORD—

Mr. CANNON. On what occasion? What was the bill?

Mr. COOPER. It is page 994 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

of the Fifty-third Congress, second session.

Mr. CANNON. Read.

Mr. COOPER (reading)—

Mr. SIMPSON—

Speaking to Mr. CANNON.

Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman not admit that we are now competing in Europe with the different countries of the Old World for the sale of our wheat?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; with Roumania, Russia, and India.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman will admit that the price we receive there fixes the price of our article not only in the United States but in the foreign markets?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; all prices are regulated by the prevailing market, wherever it is.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman then went on to say—I will be candid with the gentleman—that he thought we should protect by a tariff our market here so that we could develop a market and consume all we produce and not have any surplus, but he unequivocally stated, and I have always carried the impression and never heard it doubted, that the surplus in competition with the world fixed the price. If we could get more at home we would not sell the surplus over there.

Mr. CANNON. I fancy that I might, on reading all that was said, possibly have nothing to apologize for in a speech made, I take it, in running debate in 1894. I have no pride in what I have said in former years. Let me say to the gentleman, I can turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the first Congress in which I served, the Forty-third Congress, and I can show him where I, too, believed that commerce knew no boundaries, and that there should be universal free trade. I had not the benefit of a college education. I had practiced law for a living until I came down here at the age of 36. It did not take me long by study and observation to become a Republican in fact as well as in name, and, being converted to the true faith, I suppose I will die in it. I have no pride in what I have said heretofore touching the matter. The gentleman can find in an examination of—

Mr. DALZELL. There is no contradiction.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care to discuss what I said although it seems to me what I said in 1894 does not conflict with what I have said to-day. The gentleman can go back, if he desires and has the interest, and hunt up my record, and he will find that in 1876, in Illinois, we made a contest for the free coinage of silver. There were only two points of difference in value between 16 of silver to 1 of gold, silver then being worth 98 cents an ounce. The issue was not metallic money, but fiat money—"be thou a dollar." I voted to put out great quantities of "sound money." It was not as sound, as subsequently developed, but it had real value, and I recollect putting my contestant out of business when I said to him, "If a fiat of the law can make a dollar, he is an infernally mean man who will

not let the Government issue millions of dollars and make us rich, inasmuch as it costs nothing."

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] yield to his colleague [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. Just one word.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, what my colleague said in his speech concerning 1894 corroborates exactly what he said to-day, namely, that the price was fixed in the market where the bulk of the product was sold. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. I care little about what I said then; I am standing by my vote on this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, on the 26th day of January last the President of the United States sent a special message to Congress embodying such legislation as would ratify and approve of what is known as the Canadian reciprocity measure. That message, Mr. Chairman, fell upon the ears of the Republican standpatters like the alarm of a fire bell at midnight. By their action and by their speeches they have constantly, on all occasions since that, demonstrated that fact. Since that message was sent to Congress it has been very generally discussed in the newspapers and the magazines and by the people throughout the country, and I verily believe that now it is more generally indorsed by the masses of the people than it was when Mr. Taft sent it to the Congress.

It is a question that, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, far exceeds the personal or the political record of any public man—a wrangle about which we have just heard on the floor of the House. In that I agree with the distinguished ex-Speaker, who has just taken his seat after a long and elaborate argument, the solution and analysis of which is simply an argument that has been made for years past in favor of protection for protection's sake, that this reciprocity measure is of great importance. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that it is a difficult matter for me to believe that any man, whether he opposes or favors this measure, can misrepresent or exaggerate its importance. It is far-reaching in its effects, and the more we study it the more we think about it, the broader and more comprehensive it becomes as to its future beneficial effect, and for that reason, as an earnest Democrat, and believing in the realization in the early future of its mutual benefits to the Governments involved, as well as the present good effect of this reciprocity, I am now and have been a cordial advocate of the measure.

But the question comes now, after this long discussion in the public press and in the magazines, as to what this measure means. It plainly draws the lines between the two great political parties of our country. It is a parting of the ways. Republican protection, which means a tariff that prohibits competition on the one hand, and a tariff for revenue, which stands for a reasonable, fair competition, on the other hand. That is really and truly what this reciprocity bill means. All the voluminous talk can not disguise the real issue. I contend without any hesitancy that the standpat Republicans on the other side of this House are right when they assert that it is a menace against the doctrine of protection for protection's sake, the foundation rock on which rests the creed of the Republican Party. I say that not only is it a menace to the doctrine of protection after the manner in which the Republican Party has upheld it, but it imperils the very existence of that party. [Applause.] By no means does this reciprocity measure contain on its face all that will be wrought by it in the future.

What is the proposition? Here we have lying on the north of us Canada with a boundary line of 3,700 miles and more, with not a popgun for defense or aggression to disturb our peace. This is no Mexican boundary to guard or to protect. There it is with more than 72,000 square miles larger than the United States. There it is with 180,000,000 acres of wheat land, 6,000,000 acres of which are now in cultivation, with a people speaking our language, with our habits and customs, living under the same labor conditions that we are, with wages about equal to ours, and who has suffered for years by a tariff wall that this country has constructed and vigilantly guarded along that peaceful boundary line for years past.

That measure which the President has sent in here, Republican President as he is, the Democrats in the last Congress sustained almost unanimously, and a majority of the Republicans voted against it. What else do we find that encourages us to believe that it is right as patriots, from an economic standpoint if nothing else, that we should support this measure?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just taken his seat, said that we have a population of 92,000,000, and that Canada, the one section he did not favor trading with, had about 9,000,000 of people. What is the record of that Caucasian people? Fifty years ago they had a population scarcely exceeding 3,000,000 people. Within the 50 years, while this country has reached a growth of population of 30,000,000 to 35,000,000, Canada increased to only about 9,000,000 of people. What did it? It was because the natural lines of trade and of commerce which gave the least resistance led to the United States, and the tariff wall we constructed was the barricade. [Applause.]

And let us look at it, Mr. Chairman, for a few moments. We can only judge of what this measure means by surrounding circumstances, conditions, and environment. The President in his special message enunciated a far-sighted policy when he called the attention of the Congress to our rapidly increasing population and our decreasing productivity, and especially in food products. Bread is just as necessary to the people as air and water, and the man, or men, who connives at its scarcity and speculates for the sake of money and deprives those who have to have bread commits a dastardly crime. [Applause.] The President in his reciprocity measure with Canada put wheat on the free list. What motive induced him to do that? Our country produces or did produce for many years over 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. After using at home all we could consume the remainder was exported. It was evident by the gradual decrease of productivity and export that a change was taking place in our economic position.

In 1909 we exported 114,268,468 bushels of wheat, and in the same year we imported 48,032 bushels, and in 1910 we imported 164,201 bushels, nearly four times as much wheat as we did the year before. Why should we not take steps to meet the inevitable congestion that will overtake us soon if some great change does not take place, by encouraging the development of the fertile wheat lands of Canada and let our people have it free of tariff. Another concurring circumstance that tends to give light as to what this reciprocity measure means and why so many Republicans are against it—a great demand came up from the people in 1906-7 that the tariff duties must be reduced. Many, many were the excuses made by the Republicans why revision should not take place. Becoming alarmed, they at last reluctantly consented to put a paragraph in their platform of 1908 to that effect and went to the country. A special session of the Sixty-first Congress was called to redeem that pledge, and when they went back to the country, on the 8th of November, 1910, the voters told them in plain words how utterly faithless and untrustworthy the Republican Party and its leaders had been in redeeming their tariff pledges by electing an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, and that is why we are here now, battling for reciprocity. [Applause.]

They undertook to convince the country, by tariff-board propositions and various other political devices, that if they got back into power once more they would certainly correct the mistakes they had made. What was the answer of the people to their suggestion, on the 8th day of November last? It was that they could not be trusted. That was it.

And now let us see. When the worthy and honorable gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] made his most learned and elaborate speech on last Saturday on this floor the result was simply to uphold the doctrine of "protection for protection's sake." The speech of the gentleman from Maine showed labor and profound study. It was a carefully prepared dissertation. He told us that whenever you open up new areas of land that we must resort to the doctrine of protection to save the lands we have been cultivating. If we follow that up to its legitimate result, but few new countries would be opened up. His speech was a mournful echo of the past. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that whenever you separate, as this reciprocity bill proposes to do, protection for protection's sake from the Republican Party it will languish and die. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the doctrine that the Republican Party stands for in every essential respect. But, Mr. Chairman, this very doctrine of protection for protection's sake was, by a confession made by the President of the United States, admitted to be wrong, and it ought to be changed. Every standpat speaker has forgotten that. I refer to his celebrated Beverly letter, written at the request of the national congressional Republican committee of August 20, 1910. What was it? I want you to listen to me while I read it. The President was making a promise, hoping to get his party back into line and power. He hoped that the people would listen to him, and he hoped in that way to reform and restore the broken and shattered ranks of his party. Paraphrasing, I will say that it seems to me as a political proposi-

tion his reciprocity measure has done as much as anything could possibly do to break down the old stand-pat Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has. What did he say in that Beverly letter? He said:

The truth is—

And emphasis is laid on that expression, "The truth is"—this is President Taft who is talking, talking to get his party restored to confidence, but he did not succeed—

The truth is that under the old protective idea the only purpose was to make the tariff high enough to protect home industry. The excess of tariff over the difference in the cost of production here and abroad was not regarded as objectionable, because it was supposed that competition between those who enjoyed the high protection would keep the price to the consumer down to what was reasonable for the manufacturer. The evil—

Of what?

of excessive tariff—

That his party had been following since it originated—

the evil of excessive tariff rates, however, showed itself in the temptation to manufacturers to combine and suppress competition, and then to maintain the prices so as to take advantage of the excess tariff rate over the difference in the cost of production abroad and here.

That is a clear-cut, plain admission by the leader of the Republican Party, the President of the United States, that the very tariff rates that we are complaining of to-day were "excessive"—an "evil"—that all the great trusts had combined and had squelched out the small industries of the same character and then enjoyed the liberty and the privilege and the power to charge just what they pleased; and they did it with the full knowledge and connivance of the Republican Party, and they oppose this reciprocity because it stops this.

And, Mr. Chairman, the wonderful accumulation of wealth and the wonderful growth of corporations in the last 15 years have come from that excessive tariff and under Republican administration. Do you suppose that honest people, people who have tried them heretofore, are going to trust the Republicans again? Why, no. They are not going to trust them, and the response of the people last November put the responsibility upon the Democratic Party. There are the words of the President himself that the manufacturers took advantage of the consumer; that they combined, and that they abused the excessive tariff by combinations; and that they put up the tariff rates so that no foreign goods could come over here, and thereby built up these colossal fortunes that we are fighting. And yet the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HENDS] in his elaborate speech of several hours says that the great object in successful government is to maintain the "equilibrium" between the factory—a dividend-bearing affair—and the farm, which is a home of areas. That is his doctrine, to maintain the "equilibrium"; to keep up and enrich the manufacturer and impoverish the farmer and make the life of the ultimate consumer one of labor and toil.

Gentlemen, that is the true doctrine of the stand-patter. That is what he means, and there has not been a speech made on either side against this measure that has not been in defense of the doctrine of protection for protection's sake. A Republican who faithfully affiliates with his party can not consistently stand for anything but protection. All on a sudden Republicans have become very considerate about the interests of farmers. I am not one of those who so largely believe that this reciprocity measure will at all militate against the interests of the farmers of this country. I remember the great words of Patrick Henry, "By the light of the lamp of experience shall my feet be guided."

If that be true, as uttered by that wonderful Virginian in the early days of the American Revolution, then what have we to go by to lead us to believe that this bill is not unfriendly to farmers? Don't you know that the reciprocal treaty made in 1854 between this Government and Canada was made by a Democratic Congress? The South at that time, it is true, was quite influential in the conduct of affairs of the Republic. Who repealed that treaty? It was the Republican Party that repealed it. Yet they come here now and complain about the things that Mr. Taft includes in his reciprocal pact. What was in that treaty of 1854? Let us look and see. Who repealed it? Undoubtedly history shows, as far as concurrent history can demonstrate anything, that it was the gathering of combined influence of money that got together and repealed that treaty of 1854, the repeal taking place in 1865.

What did Mr. Taft put in the treaty that we are now supporting? It includes cattle, fish, wheat, other grains, fresh vegetables, fruits, and dairy products, and also rough lumber and raw materials useful to our industries. And for the benefit of some of our friends on the other side of the Hall I call attention to the fact that the President, in his reciprocity message of January 26 last, said: "We ought to have free lumber."

What was in the treaty of 1854? It placed upon the free list these articles I have mentioned as being included in Mr. Taft's message, with a good many others. The treaty of 1854 put the following articles and products on the free list:

Grain, flour and breadstuffs, animals of all kinds, meats (fresh and otherwise), cotton, wool, seeds, vegetables, fruits (dried and undried), fish of all kinds, poultry, eggs, hides, furs, crude stone or marble, slate, butter, cheese, tallow, lard, horns, manures, ores of all kinds, coal, pitch, tar, turpentine, ashes, timber and lumber of all kinds, firewood, plants, shrubs, trees, pelts, wool, fish oil, rice, broom corn, bark, gypsum, grindstones, dycstuffs, flax, hemp, tow, unmanufactured tobacco, and rags.

The repeal of this treaty was then considered a public calamity. The repeal of that treaty was most harmful to the rights of American citizens relative to Canadian canals. It broke up the rights of American fishermen, granted under the treaty, to fish in the Atlantic where they pleased, without any regard to limit as to distance. All these and other troublesome and long-pending questions were reopened by the repeal of the treaty and finally settled at The Hague.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with these lights before me can anyone dare say that the treaty of 1854 and the Canadian reciprocity bill now being considered are materially different? It was the protection theory of the Republican Party that repealed the treaty of 1854 and they are struggling now to prevent its revival. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have not the time to discuss this treaty from a political standpoint. I agree with the stand-pat Republicans that, so far as the political standpoint is concerned, if the President was playing only politics and seeking to advance the political welfare of his party, it was a great blunder that he made to send in this reciprocity matter; but he was broader than that. He looked to the welfare of his home country, the economic blessings to us all, to the betterment of Canada. Mr. Chairman, we are in an extra session of Congress and should some one ask me if I thought it a wise political move for a Republican President to call into existence a hostile Congress eight months before due, I would say "No." I was one of those Members who did not want any extra session, and I believe that if we had left it to the Democrats and the Republicans of the House to vote on the question there would have been hardly a baker's dozen in favor of an extra session. But we are here, and the Democratic Members are ready to stay here until we run into the regular December term of Congress if necessary to perform and carry out our program to relieve the people. [Applause.] What have we done? I am more than gratified as a Democrat at the conduct of our leaders and our party here.

In a few days we have passed the bill for the election of United States Senators by the people; we have taken up the campaign publicity bill and put in a provision requiring report of campaign contributions before election as well as after. We have taken up, now, this reciprocity measure, and we will soon have up the "farmers' free list." All of these bills died in the Senate last session. More will be done by a Democratic Congress in this session than has been done in the last 40 years in this House in the same length of time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are following the wise policy of "one schedule at a time." We are going to keep up the good work. We were not sent here to act like a "bull in a china shop," to tear everything to pieces. We are exercising and we will continue to exercise conservatism, prudence, and care. Mr. Taft, in his Beverly letter—written, as I said before, at the request of the Republican National Committee—strongly commended acting on one schedule at a time. He certainly can not complain at the course we are pursuing. In due time our people will put up to the President a reasonable, fair reduction on the wool schedule. The country knows that the President said publicly that the woolen schedule was indefensible. I say all we have to do is to keep to the course that we have started, permit no outside influences to guide us, keep up the care, prudence, and freedom from the extreme which has so far characterized our action and has won the commendation of the country and given trouble to political opponents, and just as sure as the election takes place, as it will next year, we will nominate either Harmon, Marshall, CLARK, Wilson, Dix, or some other good Democrat and elect him President of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And you will never hear any more complaint about putting these articles on the free list. The people will welcome our conduct. We have suffered long, long years from the onerous imposition of Republican protection for protection's sake. They talk about prosperity. Is it possible that a man can believe that prosperity would come to this country alone through protection? I will tell you what I stand for, and I believe that we should avail ourselves of it, that when we work it out to the

full extent we will establish in Canada with this country of ours the same free commercial relations that exist between our States. I believe this country will welcome that hour when it comes. Let them have the same untrammelled free commercial relations that exist between the States, and I believe that this bill leads in that direction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If Canada can receive the blessings of this reciprocal agreement with a population of not an average of two citizens to the square mile, why can not our country barter and trade in the same way, when it is to our mutual benefit, with France, a country that has 200 people to the square mile, or with Germany, that has 300 people to the square mile? This is not impracticable. That is why in the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I said I look upon and welcome this reciprocity measure as a wise menace to protection for protection's sake. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the latest declaration of the Texas Democracy upon the question of free raw material is contained in the State platform of August 10, 1910, and is in these words:

We reaffirm the tariff declarations of the Democratic State and national platforms of 1896, and we expressly condemn the proposition to remove all duties from the manufacturers' raw material so long as such duties remain on the manufacturers' finished product.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the position of the Texas Democracy upon the question of free raw material, and it is this position upon that question which has called down upon the Democracy of our State severe criticism in certain quarters. In my opinion the Democracy of Texas is eminently correct in its position, and I shall briefly address myself to an examination of the criticisms which have been directed against that position.

One of the ablest and most recent assaults upon the position of the Texas Democracy upon the tariff question was set forth in a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas], and because his speech upon the doctrine of free raw material is the fairest and most logical that has attracted my notice, I shall use that speech as the basis of my remarks.

The tariff is a tax. Whatever men may have thought and said about it in the past, we of this day, both Democrat and Republican, concede that it is a tax. All taxes are burdens, and particularly so is a tariff tax, because it is incapable of just and equal distribution. All enlightened men concede that organized government can not exist without imposing the burden of taxation, and all good men are willing to submit to this burden so long as the tax is laid in accordance with the principle of equality. Favoritism and discrimination in tariff taxation as administered by the Republican Party is alone responsible for the disfavor into which the system has fallen in this country, and therein lies the vice of the proposition to exempt the manufacturer from the payment of his taxes when he buys his materials, and which at the same time continues the tax against the people who buy the manufacturer's finished products.

As a means of protecting, fostering, and encouraging the manufacturing industries of this country, I shall concede that free raw material is an effective weapon. Indeed, there is no business in this country, whether it be farming, cattle raising, mining, or manufacturing, which would not be protected, fostered, and encouraged by being exempted from taxation. But the doctrine of Democracy has always been that it was an unjust and oppressive abuse of the taxing power of the Government to tax one man or one avocation in order to protect, foster, or encourage another man or avocation. For almost a hundred years the Democratic Party has warred upon Whig and Republican injustice in administering discriminatory and unequal laws of tariff taxation, so framed as to stimulate a certain class of industry at the expense of the general taxpayers of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The fear of injuring the manufacturing industries of this country has always been the excuse of the Republican Party for the imposition of burdensome and excessive import taxes, but it is indeed a strange doctrine to proceed from Democrats who profess to adhere to the Democratic principle of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

Those Democrats who propose exempting domestic manufacturing industries from taxation by means of free raw material rest their case upon the following grounds. They say:

First, it is necessary to give the manufacturer free raw material in order to prevent injury, disaster, and handicap to his business. Second, they say, it is necessary to give the manufacturer free raw material to enable him to build up an export trade and to successfully compete in foreign markets with foreign manufacturers. Third, because, they say, it is futile to tax the manufacturer, inasmuch as he adds such tax into the cost of his finished product and it is paid by the consumer.

My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas] very ably presents the position of those Democrats who adhere to these views. He assigns the following reason for the first contention:

My remarks now shall be directed especially to the question as to how the duties must be laid under a revenue-tariff system so as not to handicap or injure any of the industries of the country. I shall undertake to show that this can be done only by placing the raw materials of manufacture on the free list. I shall undertake to show that without the importation of such raw materials free of duty a tariff only for revenue, as contradistinguished from a tariff for protection, is impossible without disaster to many of our industries, from which it will follow that the free raw material is the true Democratic doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, the proposition to exempt the manufacturer from the payment of his taxes by means of free raw material for the purpose of saving his business from handicap, injury, and disaster, is, to my mind, but stating the Republican position negatively. To save from injury is but another name for encouragement; to hold harmless against disaster is but protection negatively announced, and to insure against handicap is at least equivalent to fostering. Neither the Republican doctrine of protection nor this pseudo-Democratic doctrine of saving from injury, is the true principle upon which our tariff laws should be based. The use of the taxing power of the Government for the avowed purpose of protecting, fostering, and encouraging one man's business at the general expense is an iniquitous abuse of power; and it is equally unjust to exempt one man's business from the payment of its just proportion of taxes as a means of saving that business from injury, handicap, and disaster. It is an abuse of power to tax or untax any class of persons or enterprises for the purpose of affirmatively aiding or of negatively preventing injury, where such assistance is given by special privilege at the expense of all other classes of persons and enterprises. The Republican doctrine of taxing all the people for the purpose of encouraging a few, is not improved upon by the proposition to give the manufacturer exemption from taxation by increasing the taxes of everyone else.

The second reason assigned in support of free raw material is that it will enable the manufacturer to build up an export trade. Quoting again from the speech of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas], he says:

If our manufacturers were not burdened by a tax upon their raw material, they would need no protection, and the duty upon their products could be reduced to a revenue basis. They could go into foreign markets and meet the competition of the world.

The solicitude for the manufacturing industries entertained by those who desire to give them free raw material has already been anticipated by the Republican Party in the drawback provision, so far as articles manufactured for export is concerned. The present tariff law, written by the Republican Party, contains the provision—

That where imported materials on which duties have been paid are used in the manufacture of articles manufactured or produced in the United States there shall be allowed on the exportation of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the material used, less 1 per cent of such duties.

The effect of this provision is to relieve the domestic manufacturer from the payment of his raw-material tax upon all articles manufactured for the export trade. In the light of the drawback provision above quoted from it is evident that those who now advocate free raw material for domestic manufacturers do so as a means of giving the manufacturers a bounty not enjoyed by other people, and not for the purpose of increasing our exports.

It is very evident to my mind, Mr. Chairman, that when the time arrives that our domestic manufacturers can pay freight and insurance and successfully compete in foreign markets, there will no longer be occasion for the anxiety manifested by protection Republicans or the solicitude exhibited by free-raw-material Democrats for the safety of our manufacturers in our home markets as against the competition of foreign manufacturers with freight charges and insurance against them. I shall not contend, Mr. Chairman, that it would not benefit the manufacturer to exempt him from the payment of his taxes. On the contrary, I know it would aid him greatly. There is no man or business that would not likewise be aided by exemption from taxation. I doubt not that if you exempt the manufacturer from the payment of his taxes it would enable him to wage a more effective war with his competitors abroad in the markets of the world. It would also encourage the farmer, the stockman, and, indeed, all men, to free them from the burden of paying taxes. The farmer, for instance, if relieved of the handicap of taxes, could more successfully invade the foreign markets with the products of the farm.

But the point I wish to emphasize is that it is an abuse of the taxing power of the Government to exempt one class of men or

enterprises from those necessary burdens of organized society at the inevitable expense of the balance of the community, even though such favoritism does operate affirmatively to protect, foster, and encourage or negatively to save from injury, handicap, and disaster. Equal and uniform taxation is, and will ever remain, the watchword of true Democracy, and special privilege under this doctrine is equally hateful whether bestowed affirmatively by taxing all men for the benefit of a few or negatively by exempting a few men from taxation at the expense of the many. If the manufacturer demands a free market in which to make his purchases, he ought to be willing to give the people a free market in which to make their purchases. If the exigencies of government are such that both must contribute by tariff taxation to its maintenance, then let us divide and lighten the burden by imposing a part of it upon each. To take all the tax from the backs of the consumer and place it upon the backs of the manufacturer would be no more unfair than the reverse of that proposition, which would result from free raw material. If it is just and wise to relieve the manufacturer from the payment of his indirect taxes, why should not State, county, and municipal governments avail themselves of the wisdom of this theory and exempt manufacturers from all taxes? If exemption from taxation in the one case would afford some degree of insurance against injury, disaster, and handicap, then exemption in all cases would vouchsafe greater assurance against those misfortunes which are likely to overtake any business.

The statement that untaxed raw material would enable our manufacturers to successfully compete with foreign manufacturers in the foreign markets proves entirely too much. It is not so much competition across the ocean that the American people demand as competition at home, in the very markets where they are compelled to buy and sell. But let us suppose that our manufacturers, if given exemption from taxation in the purchase of their materials, would be enabled to carry their goods across the ocean, pay freight charges and insurance, and still sell in the foreign markets cheaper than the foreign manufacturer. What prospect would we then have of obtaining foreign competition? For surely if the foreign manufacturer, with freight charges and insurance in his favor, was undersold in his own market by our manufacturers, he could not pay freight, insurance, and even a moderate revenue duty and bring his goods from the abandoned market at home and hope to compete in this market with the rival who had undersold him at home. So, if this contention were true the effect would be to destroy rather than to encourage a healthy foreign competition.

The third reason assigned by those who would remit the taxes of the manufacturer is that it is futile to collect taxes from the manufacturer, because, they say, he will but add the tax thus paid into the cost of his finished product, and it must be paid by the consumer at last. Quoting from my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas] upon this phase of the discussion, he says:

If a manufacturer should import raw material for his own use, or if he purchases raw material imported by some one else upon which a duty is paid, he adds such duty into the cost of his finished product, and it is paid by the consumer.

If this proves anything, Mr. Chairman, it proves that it is futile to tax any man or business that has the power to add the tax to the cost of the thing sold. Under such a system of emancipation the first great enterprises which would come in for freedom from taxation would be the great railroads and other public-service corporations, in whose behalf the Supreme Court of the United States has already announced the proposition that they can justly and legally add not only taxes, but all other operating expenses, and a reasonable profit as well, to the service sold the public. Under such a monstrous principle of taxation all persons and all property would be exempt from the burdens of supporting the Government save and except the utterly defenseless. The Steel Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Oil Trust, and, in fact, all trusts would cease to pay taxes, because their ability to add the tax into the prices of the thing they sell is as great, if not greater, than the ordinary domestic manufacturer. Under this specious doctrine of special privilege it would be a waste of time to tax the merchant, because he would add the tax to his selling price. Nor would it avail to tax the professional man, because he would but add the tax to the charge for his services. Through the meshes of this net of favoritism all men would escape except the defenseless multitude who have not the power to pass their burdens along to the shoulders of others. But these defenseless victims of every scheme of privilege and inequality are not always able to pay taxes, and it is doubtful if any scheme of taxation could be devised which would afford sufficient revenue to maintain the Government based upon the principle of tax-

ing only those who were too weak and helpless to pass any part of the burden to the shoulders of others.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the manufacturer proposes to recoup himself for import taxes paid when he sells the finished product. He also proposes to add to the price of the finished product all the other elements of cost, such as freight, interest, insurance, and State, county, and municipal taxes. After adding all the elements of cost to the price of his finished product, he then adds, in addition, as much profit as the laws of competition will allow. If a manufacturer suddenly found all his taxes, direct and indirect, and other fixed charges as well, remitted by governments and individuals, he would still exact for the finished product as great a price as his customers would endure. It is true of all men under all circumstances that they seek to obtain the highest possible price for what they sell and to pay the lowest possible price for what they buy. In this regard the manufacturer is not unlike the farmer. If you were to free the farmer from the payment of his taxes, he would still demand the highest possible price for his produce. To expect a different course from merchant, manufacturer, or farmer would be to expect in vain a reversal of the laws of nature and the laws of trade. If an example of this apparent truth were needed, we have a very recent one fresh in the memory of this body. Until the enactment of the Payne tariff bill the manufacturers of boots, shoes, harness, and other leather goods were paying in import taxes to the Federal Government on imported hides about \$2,000,000 a year. By the terms of the Payne bill this \$2,000,000 was remitted to the manufacturers by placing their raw material on the free list. It is undoubtedly true that the remission of their taxes reduced the cost of production of these manufacturers the \$2,000,000 which they had formerly paid to the Government. But it is equally true that their selling price has not been reduced, but, on the contrary, has actually been increased. A tax was retained on the finished product sufficient to keep out the foreign manufacturer, and as a result the purchasers of leather goods not only did not receive any benefit from the remission of the manufacturer's tax on his raw material, but was affirmatively injured, because the resulting loss of revenues to the Government were necessarily made up by increasing his taxes upon other articles. Free raw material means the exemption from taxation of the things the manufacturer buys and an inevitable increase of the taxes paid by the people upon what they buy. If the emancipation of one man from the burdens of taxation could be effected without increasing the burdens of all other men, the operation would still be open to the charge of favoritism and inequality. But what must be said of a proposition to relieve one class of persons of their tax burdens by increasing the burdens of all other men?

If the contenders for free raw material are correct in their position that it is futile to tax the manufacturer because he will in turn demand a return of the tax from his customers, then indeed must our system of taxation be reversed and remodeled. The manufacturer will always purpose to collect the tax he pays from the jobber to whom he sells. The jobber in turn will purpose to collect the tax from the wholesale merchant, and he in turn from the retail merchant and this last from his customers, the ultimate consumer. In this line of dealers, each of whom purposes to add the tax to his selling price, it is as futile to tax the one as the other, for they are each actuated by the common purpose to visit the burden upon the purchaser. The railroad company purposes to add its taxes to freight and passenger tolls, and the telegraph, telephone, and express companies operate upon the same principle. The farmer himself is equally solicitous to add his taxes to the price of the things he sells, and if he fails to do so it is not because he is deterred by altruistic considerations. But the ability of the farmer, merchant, manufacturer, or public-service corporation to add taxes paid to the selling price of his or its goods or services depends upon a variety of circumstances to be considered in any proposition to remit taxes. If the farmer manages well and wisely and is not visited with disaster in the seedtime and harvest he is usually enabled to add his taxes into the selling price of his produce. But his ability to do so not only depends upon his skill and industry, but upon the condition of the markets and the elements of nature as well. The burden is upon him to do all in his power to keep down the cost of production to a point where he can meet competition, and even then he must take his chances with the weather and market conditions. If the farmer neglects to till his fields or is overtaken by storm or drouth he will not be able to add his taxes into the selling price of his produce. And the manufacturer should be willing to meet the same requirements and take his chances upon the same conditions. If the manufacturer wisely and economically conducts his business and is fortunate enough

to escape those disasters which so often befall all lines of human endeavor, he will be enabled to secure a return of his taxes in the thing he sells. But he has no assurance of the return. He must keep the cost of production down to a point that will enable him to meet competition if the taxes he paid to the Government is to be returned to him in the price of his finished product. No man purposes to sell without making a profit. Profit must include taxes as well as the other elements of the cost of production, and the ability of the seller to recoup himself should depend in all cases upon his ability to meet competition. Every tax paid by those whose business it is to acquire, produce, or manufacture for sale is treated as an advance and added into the cost of production with the purpose of securing a return from the buyer and a profit as well. The Government is under neither a legal or moral obligation to insure any class of persons or enterprises that taxes paid will be returned to them in the final sale of their goods. That is a risk which all men are justly obligated to assume, and the issue is one of business management and not of governmental favoritism.

POPULATION IS DRIFTING TO THE CITIES.

Mr. Chairman, the whole tendency of our tariff system has been to safeguard and encourage the manufacturing interests at the expense and to the discouragement of agricultural and pastoral pursuits. The result has manifested itself in a hundred harmful ways, but in none more striking than that exhibited by the census returns. Under this system of favoritism to the manufacturing industries and discrimination against the rural population, our cities have become overgrown and congested, while everywhere in the country is presented the spectacle of abandoned farms. Who can blame the farmer or the farmer's son for leaving the farm for the city when he beholds his own avocation discriminated against and neglected by a Government bent upon bestowing all its favors on manufacturing enterprises of the cities. If the farmer is compelled to pay his own tax and that of the manufacturer as well, the tendency naturally will be for him to abandon his own avocation and engage in some other business less burdened. It is unfortunate for the well-being of this Republic that our population is drifting to the cities and manufacturing centers. The agricultural population is by far the safest and most stable constituents of free government. Mr. Chairman, I am utterly opposed to favoritism in government. A just government will confer equal rights upon all and exact equal burdens from all the people. But if this Government is committed to the doctrine of favoritism and can not be dissuaded from that unjust course, then it is high time we select the agricultural class as the objects of our especial care. For a hundred years they have been compelled to bear a double burden under the pretext that it was necessary in order to foster and protect the manufacturing industries. The worst evils to flow from the pernicious doctrine of free raw material would be a further discouragement of pastoral and agricultural pursuits. If the manufacturer is to be relieved of his taxes by this free raw-material device, thus inevitably laying added burdens upon all other classes of taxpayers, the farmers will continue to send their sons to the cities and manufacturing centers. When gentlemen talk of imposing taxes for the purpose of encouraging, or remitting taxes for the purpose of saving from handicap the manufacturing industries, they should remember that these artificial helps and aids to one class of people is at the inevitable expense of all the balance of the people. And for every encouragement they afford one man by exempting him from taxation, they do to that extent discourage some other man, whose burdens are increased in the operation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no sort of prejudice against the struggling millions who flock to the cities in an effort to avail themselves of the special privileges bestowed by this Government upon those engaged in manufacturing. I have no criticism to make against country people who flee from the farm to the city. So long as the Government pursues the policy of discouraging the pursuits of the country and encouraging the pursuits of the city we may expect this condition to prevail. What, sir, is the doctrine of free raw material but a command to the farmer and stock raiser to abandon his calling and move to the centers of population? You say by this doctrine that farming and stock raising do not rise to the dignity of domestic industries. If the manufacturer wants to purchase materials for his business you remit his taxes as an encouragement to his industry. But when the farmer wants to purchase materials for his business you demand that he pay a double tax in the purchase. By this selfish contortion of the tariff laws you declare that farming and stock raising are not such industries as are worthy to be encouraged. You go even further in your discrimination, for you demand that the producers of raw material shall pay

the manufacturer's tax as well as their own. What has been the fruits of this favoritism to those engaged in manufacturing? The fruits, sir, are the untilled fields and abandoned homes of the country and the congested slums and teeming millions of the city.

Not only is our swelling tide of foreign immigration flocking to the cities as soon as they set foot upon our shores, but the native population are no longer content to remain in the country. The recent report of the Immigration Commission reveals a startling state of affairs in this regard. A census of the pupils in the schools of 37 of our largest cities shows that 58.5 per cent of the total are the children of foreign-born fathers. In the great city of New York 71.4 per cent of the pupils were the children of foreign-born fathers, and in the cities of Chelsea, Mass., and Duluth, Minn., the percentage was 74.1 in each city.

The Secretary of Agriculture in his 1909 report strongly emphasizes the depopulation of the farming districts in the following summary:

With the rapid extension, also, of our industrial life and the opportunities offered in the past in business and in the professions the cities have called upon the country for clear brains and vigorous bodies to such an extent that large areas have become so depopulated of active and vigorous minds and bodies that the stock is insufficient to repeople the country districts. The result has been that some of the most fertile lands in our Eastern States, some of the most fertile lands of the world, have been left in a condition of practical if not actual abandonment, and the price of provisions has increased for the simple reason that there are not enough people to actually work the soils and to raise the crops necessary to feed the nonproducing population of the cities.

In the face of these conditions gentlemen propose a further discouragement of the pursuits of the country by discriminating against the farmer's produce, which they are pleased to arbitrarily classify as raw material.

I do not find fault with those who want to give legitimate encouragement to domestic industries, but I do most seriously object to a classification which excludes the farmer, the stock raiser, the mechanic, and all others except those who give the finishing touches to articles of commerce. The farmer whose products feed the world is as much engaged in domestic industry as the manufacturer who converts the products of the farm into a more refined state. Stock raising is a domestic industry as important as the manufacture of leather. The great trouble with those who demand free raw material for the manufacturer upon the plea that it is necessary in order to save domestic industries from harm is that they omit all agricultural and pastoral pursuits from the list of domestic industries.

THE OLD DEMOCRACY.

Prior to the Civil War the Democratic Party very largely controlled the tariff legislation of this country. Under the administration of a long line of able Democratic Presidents the agricultural and pastoral pursuits were recognized as important avocations. Prior to the Civil War no man ever heard of a Democrat who advocated free raw material for the manufacturer. Of all the ante bellum Presidents James K. Polk was by all odds the best equipped upon this question. He was for many years a Member of the House of Representatives, was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Speaker of the House. Polk was the best informed man of his time upon the tariff question. In a work entitled "The Messages and Papers of the Presidents," compiled under the direction of Congress by Hon. James D. Richardson, I find these statements as to President Polk's position in the councils of the Democratic Party:

He was prominently connected with every leading question, and upon all he struck what proved to be the keynote for the action of his party. During the whole period of President Jackson's administration he was one of its leading supporters and at times its chief reliance.

It is a coincidence worthy to be set down that President Polk brought Texas into the Union, and that Texas has furnished to the Union the ablest defender of Polk's views and the views of Democracy upon the tariff question.

In his first annual message to Congress President Polk defined with great care the position of the Democratic Party upon the tariff question. I quote from that message:

In levying a tariff of duties Congress exercises the taxing power, and for purposes of revenue may select the objects of taxation. They may exempt certain articles altogether and permit their importation free of duty. On others they may impose low duties. In these classes should be embraced such articles of necessity as are in general use, and especially such as are consumed by the laborer and the poor as well as by the wealthy citizen. Care should be taken that all the great interests of the country, including manufactures, agriculture, commerce, navigation, and the mechanic arts, should, as far as may be practicable, derive equal advantages from the incidental protection which a just system of revenue duties may afford. Taxation, direct or indirect, is a burden, and it should be so imposed as to operate as equally as may be on all classes in proportion to their ability to bear it. To make the taxing power an actual benefit to one class necessarily increases the burdens of the others beyond their proportion, and would

be manifestly unjust. The terms "protection to American industry" are of popular import, but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or planter who toils yearly in his fields is engaged in "domestic industry," and is as much entitled to have his labor protected as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic, who are engaged also in "domestic industry" in their different pursuits. The joint labors of all these classes constitute the aggregate of the "domestic industry" of the Nation, and they are equally entitled to the Nation's protection. No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipient of protection, which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the "domestic industry" of the others.

My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas], in his speech above quoted from, employs this language:

So it is always safe to bet that the man who advocates a tax on raw material is in his sympathies at heart a protectionist, and whenever protectionists need his help they usually get it.

By the side of that indictment against those of us who denounce the doctrine of free raw material I place the latest declaration of the Democracy of Texas, in which it is declared that—

We expressly condemn the proposition to remove all duties from the manufacturer's raw material so long as such duties remain on the manufacturer's finished product.

As a further indictment against the Democracy of Texas my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas] says:

Mr. Chairman, a tax upon raw material is distinctly and emphatically a Republican doctrine.

If that statement is true, then Texas, the banner Democratic State of this Union, is intensely Republican. If that pronouncement is to be accepted, then this Democratic House finds itself under the leadership of a Republican. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and floor leader of the Democrats in this body [Mr. UNDERWOOD] distinctly condemned the doctrine of free raw material so recently as March 25, 1909, when the Payne tariff bill was under discussion. Upon that occasion Mr. UNDERWOOD said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider the bill before the House. I want to call the attention of the committee to these paragraphs that provide for free raw material. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] announced in his opening statement that he was a believer in the doctrine of free raw material. Being a protectionist, I believe he can justify his position in favor of free raw material. As far back as three-quarters of a century ago Henry Clay announced that one of the ways in which you could protect the industries of the country was to give them free raw materials. Manifestly so. Protection looks to giving some one something, and it is of no importance to the manufacturer at which end of the line you give him the protection, whether you raise the tariff taxes so high as to prevent competition from abroad and enable him to control the entire market at his own prices or whether, on the other hand, you exempt him from the taxation that is being paid by other people and give into the coffers of his treasury a free gift that other people are required to pay for. But I do say that if the theory of the Democratic Party is a correct one, that we are only entitled to levy taxes for the purposes of raising revenue, then we should distribute taxation as broadly as possible, so that its burdens may be borne equitably and evenly by all. That being the case, I do not see how a Democrat can justify himself in the position that what the manufacturer buys should be free and what the people use should be taxed. When he comes to that proposition he admits that he is giving the manufacturer an exemption from taxation for the purpose of making his business prosperous and refuses to levy tariff taxes for the same purpose. Is not the doctrine of free raw material exactly the same position the Republican protectionist takes when he proposes a high protective tariff to make business prosperous? But although the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] may be consistent in his theory in believing in free raw material as a Republican doctrine, I do not believe he has been consistent in his theory in applying his principles to the bill that is presented to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel to make with such of my Democratic associates as believe in free raw material. If they can reconcile their consciences and constituents in the espousal of this device of protection, I shall patiently abide the day of their enlightenment and regeneration. But I do quarrel with such of them as seek to dress this old Republican fraud up in Democratic garments and parade it before the country as the first-born of Democracy. The doctrine of free raw material is either the legitimate progeny of the Whig-Republican Party or it is a political bastard. It was never conceived in Democratic brains or warmed at Democratic breasts.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK, always safe and true as a leader of the hosts of Democracy, is one of the innumerable and unquestionable authorities for the statement that free raw material is not of Democratic origin. So recently as March 24, 1909, Speaker CLARK delivered a speech upon the floor of this House in which he made that matter clear in these words:

A political remark about free raw material may be apropos. There has been a great hullabaloo in later days about free raw material being the Democratic doctrine. It is not true at all. I will tell you what it was. Henry Clay said, in the greatest speech ever made in America in favor of a high protective-tariff system—and, by the way, if he and Alexander Hamilton could get hold of these schedules of woolen manufactures, or hear of them, they would turn over in their graves and curse the day on which they ever advocated the system. But in the greatest speech ever made in America in favor of a high protective-tariff system Henry Clay put down free raw material as one of the four means of working protection. That statement can not be denied. There is no sort of objection to any man's advocating free raw material if he desires, but he ought to give the correct reason for so doing.

Mr. Chairman, the sooner Democrats cease to talk about free lists and begin a systematic and scientific adjustment of our tariff laws the better it will be for the Democratic Party and the country. Let us equalize the burdens of the tariff and the benefits will equalize themselves. If an equal and uniform tax is impossible, that affords no good reason for abandoning the principle of equality and uniformity in adjusting the tax. We should so levy the tax that it will be as nearly equal and uniform as possible. A light tax upon a large number of articles is less burdensome than a heavy tax upon a few articles. If we will make the entire list of imports tax bearing, a light tax upon each article will suffice for the needs of the Government, but if a portion of the articles imported are given free-list immunity from taxation the tax upon the remaining articles must inevitably be made to yield greater revenue. I would scatter the burdens of the tariff tax over a wide range of articles, and if incidental benefits to any class of persons or avocations result from the imposition of the tax, these benefits would likewise be widely distributed. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I leave my own seat because from that place it is impossible to be heard. Listening to the arguments that have been made against this reciprocity treaty I have been struck with one fact, and that is the fact that this great and glorious country of ours is the poorest country on earth in the sense that we are absolutely unable to compete on our own ground with the inhabitants of any other quarter of the globe. We can not compete in cattle or sheep with the warm regions of South America; we can not compete in farm products with the colder regions of Canada; we can not compete with the bleak plains of Siberia; we can not compete with the peon labor of Mexico; we can not compete with the pauper labor of Europe, nor can we compete with the high-priced labor of the New World. We can not compete with any people in any country in any product under the sun, and Heaven itself is so cruel that the very minerals in the bowels of the earth and the trees in our forests can not compete in richness or growth with any other land. Under the same reasoning, the same class of gentlemen, if the Constitution in the beginning had not forbidden the levying of any duty between the States, would in each and all of our States have erected tariff walls against each other. In Texas they would contend that Texas could not compete with Kansas in corn and they would contend that Kansas could not compete with Minnesota in wheat. They would contend that Minnesota could not compete with California in lumber or fruit; that Georgia could not compete with Florida in oranges, and so on through the long list. They would have had 46 different systems of protective tariff, erecting a wall around each and every one of our States. They would have had a system of petty, picaresque protection that would have enabled the few in each State to be enriched at the expense of the many. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And perhaps in the magnitude of the splendid resources in such a State as Texas the protectionists there would have been pointing to the wonderful progress of Texas and saying that protection for Texas had built up its industries and made for its prosperity.

The truth is that this country is so largely prosperous as it is to-day because it embraces the largest multitude of free-born, industrious citizens, among whom there is absolute free trade that was ever in the history of the world given free commercial intercourse. Our country has greater natural resources and a greater enlightened population than was ever gathered under the folds of any government of the earth before, and it is the free trade between these magnificent peoples that enables them to prosper, as they have prospered in spite of the hampering of your protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those gentlemen who sing the praises of protection do not compare Germany and France with England, where the natural conditions are similar, though one of these countries is under free trade, comparatively, and the others under protection; but they always compare this country, the richest on the earth, inhabited by the most ingenious, industrious, and productive people in the world, with the peoples of the Old World, crowded down by the oppression of the classes for the centuries which have gone by, and tell us that our better condition here is due to protection. They never tell us that Germany is ruled by high protection, and that they term her labor pauper labor. They never tell us that England is almost free trade, and has prospered more than any nation in Europe since she adopted her free-trade policy.

This discussion gives opportunity to measure this Congress, not only as to its grasp and conception of the questions of tariff and protection, but also as to how far it understands, how fully or how slightly it realizes the dawn of the new era in

politics and the awakening of the heretofore indifferent masses under which the people are more and more determined to tear down privileges, prevent wrong and oppression, and establish justice. Do Members realize what is in the air? What does this talk about insurgents mean? What does the talk about progressives mean—progressive Republicans, progressive Democrats, set over as a force against standpat or reactionary Republicans and reactionary or standpat Democrats? What does all this volume of protest mean? What mean these sharp-tipped arrows of criticism and revolution flying through the air in every direction, arrows tipped with truth, winged with strength, and sure aimed against the high and mighty? What mean the speeches of statesmen who love their country and humanity more than they do party sign and symbol, or the lure of office? We hear the watchmen with vision and voice to see and tell of the night; we read the newspapers every day, those argus-eyed creatures of modern civilization, who pierce every nook and cranny of hidden things; we scan the pamphlets of the so-called muckraker and the magazine writer, the textbook of the political economist, the stories of the novelist, the sermons of the pulpit, and the essays of the humanitarian; the air is charged. What does it mean? It means that the people are in revolt against privilege, oppression, greed, and corruption. Populism and socialism in this country in the nineties was in great measure a protest against the treason of the great popular leaders, who served their masters, not the people, too well.

A wilder storm than Populism may sweep this land if we of this day do not put a curb on unholy greed and make sure that public servants shall indeed serve the people and not other masters.

But, Mr. Chairman, I diverge too far. A local paper on April 16 had this editorial:

SENATE TO ADOPT OMNIBUS BILL PLAN—FINANCE COMMITTEE WILL CAST ASIDE TARIFF PROGRAM PREPARED BY DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY IN HOUSE AND SO MAKE REVISION IMPROBABLE.

When the House of Representatives has finished its tariff program—has passed Canadian reciprocity, its free-list bill, and several schedule revision bills—the Senate Committee on Finance will throw the whole product to the winds and proceed on entirely new lines.

The Senate program will be based on the omnibus bill plan. That is, instead of bringing out the different House bills as separate measures, the Finance Committee will take up the entire series of them, re-form them into a single general tariff-revision bill, and bring this before the Senate.

In doing this the Finance Committee will produce a situation calculated greatly to weaken the chance for any tariff legislation at all to pass.

STRANGE MIXTURE OF MOTIVES.

A strange mixture of motives will account for the Senate's adoption of this program. The regular Republican Senators, of course, favor the omnibus plan because it gives opportunity for that logrolling which has always been the determining influence in making measures. They will be able to trade among different interests and groups and industries; to hold one group in line for high duties which it does not want with the threat that if reduction is made at one point it will have to be carried throughout the list.

DEMOCRATIC DIVERGENCE.

Then there are two elements of Democrats—progressive and conservatives—on tariff. Among these the division and the divergence of motives is no less acute than among the different stripes of Republicans. Some of them represent States in which protection sentiment has become a factor too important to be entirely ignored. It is crystallized about particular interests, industries, and localities. It is responsible for the bitter antagonism of powerful lumber interests in Arkansas to removal of the lumber duties. It accounts for the fact that Senator CLARKE of that State has lately been accounted a protection Democrat.

This same influence has long made the Louisiana Senators frank protectionists because of sugar. It is making itself felt powerfully in expressions that come from the live-stock and rice industries of Texas. It has made Florida only second to Louisiana among Southern States as a protectionist Democracy because of the Florida fruit interests. It writes the story of Senator SIMMONS's vote for the lumber duties.

The article goes on—I will not read it further now, but I will simply say that it recalls to my mind the suggestion made by the gentleman from Minnesota the other day, who wanted to inject into this bill an amendment adding our free-list bill to this, saying that if we were sincere we would accept the amendment. Ah, in doing that he is charging insincerity on the part of his President, it seems to me. But I say to him that if the Republican Senate should tack the free-list bill to this measure I would vote, when it came back to the House, to accept it, for it can not affect the treaty. I would trust that the President would not, in the face of public sentiment and of the vote of both the House and the Senate, veto that bill, but to put that measure on this bill in the House means to invite its defeat in the Senate, where surely that would then be its fate. I do not propose for this bill to be logrolled to its death. Put this bill and our free-list bill together and we almost guarantee the defeat of both. Separately, this bill will pass this House, and with the President earnestly urging it, it will surely pass the Senate; and then, if those Republicans who now profess to

want our free-list bill and want to tack it to this are honest, we will pass that, too, both here and in the Senate, and if we do, I for one believe the President will sign it. In fact, when this bill has become a law I believe our agricultural Republicans will be forced to vote for our free-list bill.

LOGROLLING HAS BEEN THE POWER BEHIND PROTECTION.

The history of tariff legislation shows, indeed, that it has been a long, fearful game in which every man has played for himself. Those whose interests were best organized always have and always will win in such a game. If no man could win an advantage under it, if every man was equally benefited and equally burdened under it, no man would want it. If one man received a benefit of \$10 from it only that he might bear the burden of paying \$10 benefit to some other man, neither of them would ask for the law. But equal benefits and equal burdens are not a part of protection.

Perhaps 10 per cent of all our people actually receive a benefit from the tariff. Perhaps 40 per cent of them think they receive such a benefit. Ninety per cent of them in fact bear the burden of the tribute that goes to the favored few. That is why those favored few move heaven and earth, spend money, bribe, and lie in order to retain a protective tariff. I represent that vast 90 per cent that bear all the burden; they are the blacksmith, the carpenter, the doctor, the lawyer, the shopgirl and the house girl, the clerk, the farmer who does not raise sheep or cattle or a special kind of wheat, and the workingman—those who toil with their hands by the day or by the month or by the year. I do not represent the capitalist whose personal and family consumption is but a fraction of his individual income. His interest is on the other side or is so comparatively small that it does not affect him. It may seem useless here to try to make plain what this tariff is—how it works and why it is so ardently defended. It is a tax; but if that were all no fight would be on in Congress over it now, nobody would urge it to be made higher, nobody could resist its reduction. Let me illustrate the tariff: If Washington were a walled town such as existed in ancient days, including within its walls all classes of citizens, say to the number of 50,000, she might include 100 families who were gardeners. Now, these 100 families could not raise on their ground all the potatoes consumed by the 50,000 people, and many bushels would be brought in through the gates of the city and sold at the general market price fixed by the law of supply and demand for the whole country round about. Just at this point there comes on the scene a gardener of great shrewdness and he says to the city council, "Our taxes to support this city government are grievous. We could make these people outside our gates pay these expenses by charging them 25 cents per bushel for every bushel they bring in." And the council, with glad acclaim, hail this proposed arrangement and put it into operation. What is the result? The outsider begins to take his potatoes elsewhere, to Baltimore or to Philadelphia, so the people begin to be short and the grocer here is compelled to go outside the gate and pay the same price for his potatoes that Baltimore does and pay that tax or charge of 25 cents himself in order to bring them in. Then if he pays the outsider 50 cents for them and the gatekeeper 25 cents entrance charge, they have cost him 75 cents per bushel, and he must have a profit when he sells them to all the people of the city who eat them, so the people at last pay that tax. But, we have forgotten that wise, shrewd gardener who is raising potatoes inside. He gets a new idea, and taking counsel with himself, says: "If the people who eat pay 75 cents for the potatoes shipped here they must pay 75 cents for my potatoes, therefore, I will raise my price," and he does that very thing. Still finding that they can not raise enough potatoes to supply the city and that potatoes are still coming through the gates and paying this tax and the people seem to know nothing about it, and, finding further, that the city government are lavish spenders and want more money, and that some of them raise potatoes themselves, he comes before the council again, and tells them the land is much richer outside the city and potatoes grow much better outside, and a thousand other things, wherefore he asks that the tax for entrance be raised to 50 cents per bushel and it is done. Now, the people in the city will pay, not 50 cents, not 75 cents, but \$1 per bushel for all the potatoes brought in and for all the potatoes the gardener raises, and, therefore, Mr. Gardener defends and demands that this law be decreed sacred and that nobody touch it, unless it be to amend it by revision upward. This, Mr. Chairman, is "the tariff."

Of course it is readily seen that if there were so many gardeners that they raised more potatoes than could be eaten inside the city and they had to go outside the gates themselves to sell their surplus, they could not have had their prices raised by this charge at the gate unless, knowing about the gate tax,

all the gardeners inside the city combined together; and having tried the outside market and found the price there to be 50 cents, they might come back into the city, put all their potatoes together, and make the people pay 50 cents plus the gate tax per bushel for all they consume inside and send all their surplus out and sell that at 50 cents. That, also, is not so bad, and that is what our Steel Trust has done. That is the trust stage of protection, which is growing every year a heavier burden and curse on our people. We growers of wheat, corn, and cotton are very much out in the cold. We never have been and never will be able to form such a trust. I very much fear that if we were situated so we could ride on the backs of our fellow citizens we would be inclined to do just as I have supposed the potato grower to have done in the walled city. On this point the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is illuminating. He says that when his mills have cut all the lumber they can sell to home consumers at the price they are able or willing to sell them at, being protected against any outside competition by the tariff wall, then it is right that they begin to sell their surplus at lower prices, not to home people, but to foreign markets, without profit or even at a loss, and keep their home price high enough to make a good profit on their entire output in that way, giving to the outsider the benefit of the great supply and cheap product and making the home consumer bear the double burden. Under this kind of protection the donkey is a fitting party symbol of Democracy, because the mass of the people bear the burden of it. We not only bear the burden of higher prices to us, but the burden of enough higher prices to enable the protected interests to go out into the outside market and by adding to the supply there still further lower the prices to the outsider. Our higher prices here help decrease home consumption and help to make a surplus in the home market, and that surplus is used to help supply the foreign demand and lower the foreign price. What does the lumber-mill man care who pays him the money, so he can cut all his lumber and make the average price a very profitable one? That is what the gentleman from Michigan said the Lumber Trust did; in effect he said they made the home people pay the profit on all the lumber they sold both at home and abroad.

Suppose, Mr. Chairman, it were proposed to make a similar distinction and discrimination as between different classes of our home people. Suppose we should say that when dull times come and a surplus of lumber is on hand the mill man might still keep his prices up as to the countryman, the farmer, but lower it to the city home builder. Would we deem it just? Yet, is it any less just and right to favor some of our home people at the expense of others of our home people than it is to favor foreigners at the expense of all our home people? No, sir; and I tell you we will never get relief from organized greed until we compel the great industries in this country to sell always, whether they are running long or short, at the same price to all buyers, whether for home or foreign trade. Then if Mr. FORDNEY's supply shall be greater than the demand at high prices, let him lower his prices; and if his supply at the lowest price at which he can profitably cut lumber becomes greater than the demand, let him stop cutting. What right, Mr. Chairman, has the lumber king to demand of you and me that we pay him more than we could buy his own lumber for anywhere else than in our own country?

I want to tell you, however, what the largest cattle grower in my county said to me. My county has a little more than 50,000 inhabitants. This gentleman, discussing with me the duty on hides, said that he rendered 600 head of cattle for taxes. He said that if the tax remained on hides and the cattle-men got all the benefit of it, it would probably amount to 50 cents per head, or \$300, to him. He also stated there were not over 300 men in the county whose cattle possession would average 20 head. This would make 6,000 cattle belonging to 300 men, and the raised price for their benefit would amount to \$3,000. "Now," he said, "if they got the money, who had to pay it?" He thought the tanner could not lose it, so when he bought the hide he would charge it up when he sold the leather to the shoemaker and harness maker, and he would also have to have some profit or go broke—that the harness man and shoe man could not lose it; that they would have to charge it up when they sold it to the man, woman, or boy who wore the shoes or used the harness—and so he said he thought the people who would ultimately pay him the \$300 and the 300 small cattle-men their \$10 each would be those 50,000 people of my county; and he finished by saying that he had no right to take this money from his people or make them give it to him and that he was not a beggar or object of charity. Mr. Chairman, this plain statement that the ultimate consumer paid the tax, or the increased price by reason of the tax, was the teaching

of every Democrat or professed Democrat until two years ago. The Republicans used to claim that the foreigner paid the tax on all imported goods, but even he never claimed that anybody but the ultimate consumer ever paid the increased price paid the home producer by reason of the tax. Even the high-tariff Republican has too much sense and conscience to deny that the original cost of any article must be carried on through its few or many stages of manufacture or transfer and finally unloaded on the ultimate consumer. This has been Democratic teaching for over 40 years, but two years ago a leader of a certain following among Democrats announced a new doctrine, to wit, that somewhere between the producer and the consumer this increase of price to the producer was absorbed and did not affect the price paid by the consumer. This new doctrine is neither Democratic nor true, but it is professed by every so-called Democrat who has some special interest or industry that he wishes to favor or help rob the people.

I want to be perfectly fair, however, to this school of Democracy, and I grant that where the tariff on any finished product is left so high as to exclude all importation, and that product is made and its price fixed by a trust, then placing on the free list the material out of which the finished product is made will not affect the price of the finished product to the consumer, and will add to the profit of the manufacturer, but in that case putting back the tariff on the raw material would increase the profits of the producer of the raw material, but neither hurt nor help the ultimate consumer. The way to benefit the consumer, the ultimate consumer, is not by putting back the tariff on raw material, but by taking the tariff entirely off of the finished product, and let me warn hopeful friends of the ultimate consumer that until we find some efficient means of destroying monopolies and combinations all tariff reduction will largely fail to give the relief we look for, and the greater the number of the people and classes that become interested in profits derived from a tariff on what they produce the harder it will be to prevent these monopolies and combinations and to break the strangle hold of the special interests on the ultimate consumer. I make this statement partly to apply to the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I am not sure that the price of some special grade of wheat may not be raised by a tariff.

It may be that there is grown in Minnesota a peculiar grade of wheat, all of which is consumed in this country, and for which the demand in this country is even greater than the supply. In my opinion, sir, a tariff tax on the importation of such wheat does have a tendency to raise its price, especially if there is a greater supply than there is demand for the same kind of wheat in Canada, our next-door neighbor, but in my opinion the effect would not be great. As its price increases the people, especially the poorer people, will use less and less of this superior grade and more and more of substitutes for it in poorer grades of flour and corn meal and other substances, while if the supply of this fine wheat increases and the price of it tends to fall, the people will use more and more of this and less and less of substitutes. Whether there be much or little of this superior wheat, it would always be higher than inferior grades of wheat, but not very much higher, because the masses will use common flour or corn meal rather than submit to too great extortion, and we all know that the price of this common wheat both in Canada and America is fixed in Liverpool and must be substantially the same and can not be affected by this treaty agreement, so that the whole effect of this law or agreement, after it has passed and conditions have become settled, its operation become normal and natural, will be so slight as to make the narrowest protectionist wheat grower wonder and ask how it has hurt him or whether it has hurt him at all; but, Mr. Chairman, if it be admitted—and from all the evidence adduced and arguments made here on this floor it is substantially true—that the same class of labor receiving substantially the same wages produce this wheat in Canada that produce it in Minnesota, and I can not see how the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] can contend that the President is wrong when he says that free trade with Canada in wheat does not violate the Republican doctrine of protection, because the Republican doctrine has been proclaimed to be that the tariff should only be high enough to equalize the cost of production in this country and abroad.

I know it is argued that the price should be made higher here than in Canada, because the market price of land in Minnesota is higher than the market price of land in Canada; but it has never been announced, Mr. Chairman, even by the Republicans, that protection ought to be made the means of equalizing the price of land or giving the landowner an equal income on the value of his land, unless the last paragraph of the last

Republican platform, which demands that a reasonable income on investments to be insured by the tariff be so construed, and that part of the platform I understand Mr. LENROOT to repudiate. Besides all this, sir, there is just as much difference in the value of lands in the different States of the Union as there is in the value of land between Minnesota and Canada.

The difference between the Canadian yield and the Minnesota yield is not near so great as the difference between the Minnesota yield and the yield in Texas. The difference in the quality of the wheat in Minnesota and Canada is not near so great as the difference in wheat in quality in favor of the Minnesota wheat over the Texas wheat. Greater yields of wheat per acre generally may be made perhaps in the North than in the South, and by the logic of the gentleman from Minnesota, if there is to be any justice in tariff, then we ought to have a tariff between the States, so as to equalize the cost of production and equalize the value of land and the yield per acre in the different States. Again, Mr. Chairman, if those who oppose this treaty on the ground that it may enable somebody to compete with their wheat products and possibly lower their price by adding to the supply of this fine wheat, if they are right, I say, they ought to oppose everything else that would have the same tendency. They ought to oppose every project for irrigating vast arid regions or for draining great swamp regions and thereby adding hundreds of millions of acres to our agricultural lands, because by these means we would increase, and vastly increase, the crops of corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs which help to feed the American people, and by this increase you will help to lessen the demand and price for the gentleman's fine wheat. We have spent millions and are spending millions more to redeem great areas of this arid and swamp land, and yet when a proposition arises under which without the expenditure of a single dollar we may have access for the purpose of raising wheat to millions of acres of land of good quality which has heretofore been cut off from us, the gentleman from Minnesota objects. There is no consistency in spending millions by the Government to irrigate a million acres of land to make it produce wheat for our people's consumption and refusing to accept a million acres of land already fitted for growing wheat when it is offered to us without money and without price.

In the same way there is no excuse for spending millions to reforest land denuded of its trees and refusing to accept all the timber and lumber free of tax that might be shipped into our borders. I want to be fair with these gentlemen. There is no question of any necessity of a tariff on wheat to equalize the labor cost of production; but there is a reason that may become powerful if our city population continues to grow and our rural population ceases to grow, under which the farmer, especially the producer of foodstuffs, may ask for a so-called protective tariff to greatly enhance the price of his products.

If this country ever ceases to produce breadstuffs or foodstuffs of all kinds sufficient for its home consumption and becomes an importer rather than an exporter of foodstuffs, then the farming interests of the United States, without any tariff, will get better prices than they ever have gotten for their products, but if they do like the manufacturing interests have done heretofore, they will combine and demand that a tariff wall be erected and a great tariff tax be imposed for their benefit, and this, even though they may be able to produce at a smaller labor cost than the countries against which they ask protection. They will see an opportunity to levy a tribute for bread upon every man, woman, and child in the United States, and they will find a reason to justify it, unless, before that day comes, we shall have been able to make right and justice and principle stronger than greed in the human heart or, unless before that day comes, we shall have abolished the system of collecting taxes by import duties and cease to hold before all our people a system under which part of the people are interested in making taxes higher and higher, because the higher the tax the greater the tribute collected by them, a system that must have been born in hell, because it tempts all men to gain the whole world at the loss of their souls.

Beyond question, if we did not raise enough wheat of all kinds to supply our people's demand for flour, corn would be resorted to as a substitute, and if we did not raise enough corn and wheat together to supply all our bread, then assuredly a tariff on corn and wheat would greatly raise the price of both—both to the grower and to the consumer. That leads me, Mr. Chairman, to the speech of the gentleman from Maine. He urged us to be guided by Germany and France, which both imposed high duties on farm products, so as to give home producers better prices. It is true that both of these countries do impose a high duty on wheat. Under what pretext I do not know, but surely not on the ground that their poorly-paid labor must be protected against the high-priced labor of America.

Doubtless the high protectionist there makes the same patriotic professions he does here, but let us see how it works out. I speak from memory and not precisely. Germany raises only about half the wheat her people consume. Her yield per acre is far greater than our own. Her landowners belong to the higher classes and embrace the lords, who are a great compact political body, well organized, and long trained to uphold their own interests. These landlords combine with the mill owners and other manufacturers to help each other to levy a tribute upon the great masses, and together these German lords, landowners, mill owners, and manufacturers have fixed upon Germany the most iniquitous tariff burdens to be found outside of the United States, and as a result of her system of laws under which the few are favored and the many are burdened, as we were told by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], her working people in the great cities scarcely know the taste of meat. He told us that in the city of Berlin an intelligent foreman of a great factory, talking of the price of living for the employees in that factory, told him that they ate no meat, but lived on potatoes, rice, and the like.

But back to German wheat. Germany has imposed a tariff of 60 cents per hundred on all imported wheat. To do this the landlord helped put on a duty for the benefit of the miller of \$1.20 per hundred on flour, to say nothing of the duty he joins in imposing on other manufactures. Then, for the further help of the miller, in order that he might have a monopoly of the grinding for German consumption, and of grinding Germans as well as German flour, they give to the miller a drawback of all the tax he pays on wheat and, I think, even a little more than that on all the flour he makes and exports from imported wheat. This is done, they say, to encourage her mill industry. Under this German law the German miller, like our manufacturer, sells high at home and low abroad. In London German milled flour sells as cheap or cheaper than American flour, but not so in Berlin; that is, the German flour does not sell as cheap in Berlin as the American or German flour sells in London. But this lure of 60 cents duty on wheat has made the German farmer for protection. The miller is for protection because of the \$1.20 per hundred duty upon his flour. All the strong organized manufacturing interests are for protection for similar reasons, and none are left to fight for simple equality but the unorganized, the weak, the defenseless. The artisan, the day laborer, the employee, the hireling, the great multitude of the poor, these may sweat and toil and receive the drippings of protection as it trickles down to them through the tight-gripping but overfull hands of the favored classes. These may pick up the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table, but some day their wrongs will cry and cry aloud till Heaven hears them. One thought more. Germany raises half her wheat and imports the other. For her home wheat the price is raised by just about the amount of the tax on wheat imported, and the price of all the flour her people consume is raised by the amount of the tax on flour, or \$1.20 per hundred. Therefore, wheat, but not flour, is imported into Germany. Now, if they consume 2,000,000,000 pounds of flour, they pay \$24,000,000 more for it than they would without the tax; but Germany only imports one-half her consumption, or, say, 1,000,000,000 pounds of wheat, on which the Government collects six millions of revenue, so by this wheat and flour duty the Government collects six millions of revenue and the people pay just four times that much, or \$24,000,000, one-fourth of which goes to the Government, one-fourth to the wheat producer, and two-fourths to the mill owner. This is a fair sample of the workings of protection; but if it shall work in this country till strong men, though laboring hard, may eat no meat and but little bread, a day of reckoning will come when just indignation and hunger will tear down the palaces of greed and oppression. Instead, sir, of insisting on their high privilege of levying tribute on all the people, ought not the gentleman from Minnesota to join us in adopting this bill, which has so many reductions of duties, and then help us to further tear down the throne of this modern Moloch of special privilege? I might be tempted, Mr. Chairman, in some instances to agree with the gentleman that we might favor a protective tariff law whose duties were based on the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad if I did not know that, under the assertion of that principle, under the profession of that faith by the Republican Party for the last 50 years, we have been led first to the Dingley bill and then to the Payne-Aldrich bill. I know, and he knows, that no such protection as he proposes is possible. I know, and he knows, that lemon growers in Florida and California, sugar growers in Louisiana and in the West, woolgrowers in Texas and Ohio will unite with the timber kings on the Pacific and in the South, and the Steel Trust in Pittsburgh, and the cattle barons of the West, and the manufacturers of the East, and alto-

gether they will work for and with each other and wring every possible dollar of tribute from the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, the subject I want most of all to discuss in connection with this Canadian reciprocity bill is lumber. I believe that before long every legislator not blinded to the welfare of the people or wedded to the interests will realize that all natural resources which may be exhausted in time, or of which our supply is limited or less than our need, ought to be imported free from any country. They are not the product of man's labor. He can not make them. Nature has planted and matured them—some of them, like the forests, in the passing centuries; others, like iron, coal, crude oil, copper, in the passing of untold ages. If we, as a Nation, might be selfish—not selfish for the few, but selfish for all our people—we might have deemed it wise to impose an export duty on all these and thereby try to reserve them or make them cheaper for our people alone, but we have not done that. By our Constitution we have forbidden that and declared there shall be no export duty—that our riches may go out free into all the world. Nevertheless, the whole country is stirred with the talk of preserving these resources from untoward destruction, and conservation of our natural resources has become a national watchword. If I could to-day double the number of standing trees on every acre of our forest; if I could double the thickness and richness of every vein of coal, copper, and iron; if I could double the output of crude oil, and place all this increase in the ownership of the Government for the benefit of all the people, would I do it? Yes; a thousand times yes; and then I would place a guard with flaming sword over these riches, to see that the Carnegies, the Guggenheims, and the Rockefellers, and the Weyerhaeusers never come near them. If we would preserve all our natural resources—if we would spend, as we do, millions to increase them—why, then, do we put up a barrier to keep out these same riches when from the abundance of other lands they seek our shores? Why, indeed, except to serve the greed of the present holders of these great riches? The lumber story, which is only one of the stories to be told, shall tell you why.

Mr. Chairman, the summary of the report of the Commissioner of Corporations, Herbert Knox Smith, on the lumber industry, part I, gives a world of information. The author of that report, Mr. Smith, says that his investigations show—

- (1) The concentration of a dominating control of our standing timber in a comparatively few enormous holdings, steadily tending toward a central control of the lumber industry.
- (2) Vast speculative purchase and holding of timber land far in advance of any use thereof.
- (3) An enormous increase in the value of this diminishing natural resource, with great profits to its owners. This value, by the very nature of standing timber, the holder neither created nor substantially enhances.

Another paragraph of his report reads:

From Government to private ownership: Only 40 years ago at least three-fourths of the timber now standing was (it is estimated) publicly owned. Now about four-fifths of it is privately owned. The great bulk of it passed from Government to private hands through (a) enormous railroad, canal, and wagon-road grants by the Federal Government; (b) direct Government sales in unlimited quantities at \$1.25 an acre.

Further on I read:

During this interval, and chiefly in the latter half thereof, the value of standing timber has increased tenfold, twentyfold, and even fiftyfold, according to local conditions. The present annual growth is only about one-third of the present annual cut. Replacement by new growth is very slow.

And this further:

Control of the timber controls the whole industry: Whatever power over prices may arise from combinations in manufacture and distribution (as distinguished from timber owning), such power is insignificant and transitory compared to the control of the standing timber itself or a dominating part thereof.

Amount of standing timber: There is now left in continental United States about 2,200,000,000 board feet of privately owned standing timber, of which 1,747,000,000 is in the "investigation area."

By "investigation area" he explains that he means the area fully covered by his investigation. I read further:

The present commercial value of the privately owned standing timber in the country, not including the value of the land, is estimated (though such an estimate must be very rough) as at least \$6,000,000,000. Ultimately the consuming public will have to pay such prices for lumber as will give this timber a far greater value.

Concentration of timber ownership: Three vast holdings alone, the greatest in the country, those of the Southern Pacific Co., the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railway Co. (including their subsidiary companies), together have 238,000,000,000 feet, or nearly 11 per cent of all our privately owned timber. With the five next largest they have over 15 per cent of the total privately owned timber and over 19 per cent of that within the investigation area. Finally, nearly one-half (48 per cent) of the private timber in that area is held by only 195 great holders. The term "holder" covers any single interest—individual, corporate, or group—which is so united as to be under one control.

The Pacific Northwest: Five-elevenths of the country's privately owned standing timber is in the Pacific Northwest (California, Oregon,

Washington, Idaho, and Montana), 1,013,000,000,000 feet. One-half of this is now owned by 37 holders; many of these are closely connected. The three largest holders (named above) alone have nearly one-quarter. This section now furnishes only one-sixth of the annual cut. Thus its timber is being largely held for the future, and the large owners there will then be the dominating influence in the industry.

The Southern Pacific Co. holding is the greatest in the United States—106,000,000,000 feet. It is difficult to give an adequate idea of its immensity. It stretches practically 650 miles along that railroad between Portland and Sacramento. The fastest train over this distance takes 31 hours. During all that time the traveler thereon is passing through lands a large proportion of which for 30 miles on each side belongs to the railroad, and in almost the entire strip this corporation is the dominating owner of both timber and land.

The second largest holder is the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. (including its subsidiary companies), with 96,000,000,000 feet. This does not include further very extensive timber interests of the Weyerhaeuser family and close associates.

These two holdings would supply the 46,584 sawmills in the country for four and two-thirds years. They have one-eleventh of our total private timber.

The third largest, the Northern Pacific Railway Co., has 36,000,000,000 feet.

These three holdings have enough standing timber to build an ordinary five or six room frame house for each of the 16,000,000 families in the United States in 1900. If sawed into lumber and placed in cars, their timber would load a train about 100,000 miles long.

The holdings of the two railroad companies are Government grants, and 80 per cent of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. holdings was bought from the Northern Pacific grant.

Southern pine region: In the southern pine region there are 634,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber. Concentration in total timber is much less than in the Pacific Northwest. There is, however, a high concentration in the more valuable species, longleaf yellow pine and cypress. Sixty-seven holders own 39 per cent of the longleaf yellow pine, 29 per cent of the cypress, 19 per cent of the shortleaf and loblolly pine, and 11 per cent of the hardwoods.

The Lake States: In Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan there are 100,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber. In Wisconsin 96 holders have three-fourths of all the timber. In Michigan 113 holders have 66 per cent. In Minnesota 6 holders have 54 per cent of the very valuable white and Norway pine, 16 per cent of the other conifers, and 2 per cent of the hard woods. Taking all three States, 215 holders have 65 per cent of all the timber.

Is it any wonder that, influenced as we all are by our environments, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] should be so intensely bitter against this reciprocity treaty, when the fact is that lumber alone is the great item that may be affected by this reciprocity? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, let me go on further with this lumber business. Mr. Smith says:

Effect of concentration: Such concentration in standing timber, if permitted to continue and increase, makes probable a final central control of the whole lumber industry. A few strong interests, ultimately holding the bulk of the timber, can set the price of timber and its products. The manager of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association recently said to lumbermen on the Pacific coast:

"The day of cheap lumber is passing and soon will be gone, but the men who make the money will be those who own timber and can hold it until the supply in other parts of the country is gone. Then they can ask and get their own price."

And I want to say, in connection with that, that in my State the thin remnant of standing timber is fast being cut down and sawed into lumber, and, not content to supply our own State from this fading supply of our timber, they seek for distant markets, and they object to any increase of our supply; and by imposing a tariff attempt to prevent us from obtaining lumber from foreign lands, whereby our present prices of lumber would be cheapened and the timber we have would be further from exhaustion. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I read further:

Certain further factors, not exactly measurable, increase still more the real concentration. First, a further interweaving of interests, corporate and personal, connects a great many holdings which the bureau has treated as separate; second, there are very large totals of timber so scattered in small tracts through larger holdings that they are substantially "blocked in" or "controlled" by the larger holders; third, the concentration is much higher in the more valuable species.

General information obtained indicates a very high concentration in timber ownership outside the investigation area.

Policy of great holders: The largest holders are cutting little of their timber. They thus reserve to themselves those incalculable profits which are still to accrue with the growth of the country, the diminishing of timber supply, and the further concentration and control thereof.

The concentration already existing is sufficiently impressive. Still more impressive are the possibilities for the future. In the last 40 years concentration has so proceeded that 195 holders, many interrelated, now have practically one-half of the privately owned timber in the investigation area (which contains 80 per cent of the whole). This formidable process of concentration in timber and in land certainly involves grave future possibilities of impregnable monopolistic conditions, whose far-reaching consequences to society it is now difficult to anticipate fully or to overestimate.

Mr. Chairman, these statements I have been reading are not wild flights of fancy or the frothings of political oratory. They are sober findings of fact by a painstaking Government official acting under resolutions adopted by Congress asking for investigation into the causes of the high prices of lumber. Now, how any man claiming to represent the people can vote to favor these lumber interests, to deny free admission to lumber, as these lumber kings demand, passes my comprehension. And

If any man should profess to believe that these lumber and timber men are not fighting free lumber by every means in their power, we must either wonder at his stupidity and credulity or at the brazen effrontery of his profession.

I want to read just a little more, and I want now to say that I shall not include in my reading some tables which I will insert with my remarks. I want to refer now to the amount of timber in the different regions.

Total standing timber in the Pacific Northwest.

[In billions of board feet. Thus, 1,512.9=1,512,900,000,000 board feet.]

States.	Total.	Privately owned.	Not privately owned.	
			National forests.	All other. ¹
Pacific Northwest.....	1,512.9	1,013.0	440.8	59.1
California.....	381.4	248.1	114.4	18.9
Oregon.....	545.8	398.1	135.8	11.9
Washington.....	391.0	294.6	81.6	14.8
Idaho.....	129.1	50.4	71.0	7.7
Montana.....	65.6	21.8	38.0	5.8

¹ Includes national parks, military reservations, unreserved public lands, Indian reservations, and timber land owned by the States.

In the southern pine region the total of 634,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber is distributed as follows:

	Billion feet.
Louisiana.....	119.8
Mississippi.....	95.3
Arkansas.....	78.7
Florida.....	73.9
Texas.....	66.0
Alabama.....	56.3
Georgia (part).....	46.0
North Carolina (part).....	42.9
South Carolina (part).....	30.7
Virginia (part).....	14.5
Missouri (part).....	9.9

In the Lake States the total of 100,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber is distributed as follows:

	Billion feet.
Michigan.....	47.6
Wisconsin.....	29.2
Minnesota.....	23.2

The lake region is the least important of the three in quantity of timber, but much of its timber is exceedingly valuable.

Concentration in the ownership of standing timber.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL HOLDINGS.

The bureau's investigation has disclosed a remarkable concentration in the ownership of the country's standing timber. A general indication of this great concentration is afforded by the following tables, in which the private timber holdings of the country are arranged by groups of holders according to size of holding in the investigation area.

Group 1 contains the timber holdings of the Southern Pacific Co., the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railway Co. The other groups contain the holdings ranging between the limits shown below:

Group 2: From 13,000,000,000 feet to 25,000,000,000 feet.
Group 3: From 5,000,000,000 feet to 13,000,000,000 feet.
Group 4: From 3,500,000,000 feet to 5,000,000,000 feet.
Group 5: From 2,000,000,000 feet to 3,500,000,000 feet.
Group 6: From 1,000,000,000 feet to 2,000,000,000 feet.
Group 7: From 500,000,000 feet to 1,000,000,000 feet.
Group 8: From 250,000,000 feet to 500,000,000 feet.
Group 9: From 125,000,000 feet to 250,000,000 feet.
Group 10: From 60,000,000 feet to 125,000,000 feet.
Group 11: Less than 60,000,000 feet.

For the entire investigation area the extent of concentration, by these groups, is as follows:

Concentration of timber ownership by groups in entire investigation area.

Group.	Number of holders.	Amount of timber owned, in billions of feet.	Per cent of total.
Total.....		1,747.0	100.0
Groups 1 to 10.....	1,802	1,208.8	69.2
Group 1.....	3	237.5	13.6
Group 2.....	5	102.0	5.8
Group 3.....	14	119.5	6.8
Group 4.....	26	115.3	6.6
Group 5.....	42	116.2	6.7
Group 6.....	105	149.2	8.5
Group 7.....	190	132.4	7.6
Group 8.....	273	96.4	5.5
Group 9.....	489	84.8	4.9
Group 10.....	655	55.5	3.2
Group 11.....		538.2	30.8

From these tables it will be seen that 3 holdings include no less than 237.5 billion feet, or nearly 11 per cent of the privately owned timber in the entire country, and over 13.5 per cent of the privately owned

timber in the investigation area. These 3 holders are the Southern Pacific Co., the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railway Co. Five other holders ranking next in importance own in the investigation area an aggregate of 102 billion feet, or 4.6 per cent of the total privately owned timber of the country and 5.8 per cent of that in the investigation area. Thus the 8 largest holders together own approximately 340 billion feet of timber, or 15.4 per cent of the total privately owned timber of the country and 19.4 per cent of that in the investigation area.

Twenty-two holders own 26.2 per cent of all the timber in the investigation area; 195 holders own 48 per cent. Stated in another way, more than one-eighth of the total timber in the investigation area (this representing 80 per cent of the total privately owned timber of the United States) is owned by only 3 holders; more than one-fourth is owned by only 22 holders. Almost one-half is owned by 195 holders.

The most marked concentration is in the hands of the comparatively few large holders of the upper groups; the lower groups control a much less important percentage. Thus, while the 385 holders in groups 1 to 7, inclusive, control 55.6 per cent of the timber in the investigation area, the 273 holders in group 8 control only 5.5 per cent, the 489 holders in group 9 only 4.9 per cent, and the 655 holders in group 10 only 3.2 per cent.

Furthermore, these 10 groups, 1,802 holdings, embrace nearly 70 per cent of the total timber in the investigation area, while group 11, the remaining holdings, aggregating unnumbered thousands, have in all only 538.2 billion feet, or 30.8 per cent of the total.

This pronounced concentration is discussed in detail later. At the moment it is essential to point out a few general considerations as to the significance of these figures.

There are other matters in this report showing how these large holders have locked in and hold at their mercy smaller holdings, and how at various times under various laws they have been able to exchange their poorly timbered for the choicest timbered lands, how they never sleep, and so forth, but I must desist. I think I have shown enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY. May I have just a little more time, say, just 10 minutes? How much did I have?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had one hour. I promised to let the gentleman from Massachusetts in.

Mr. HARDY. I can conclude in five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, then I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that the great thing involved in this reciprocity treaty is the opportunity to be given to our people to get the benefit of cheaper lumber, one of the common necessities. I may say that there may be differences of opinion as to whether there will be a slight fall or rise in the price of wheat. It may be that if the tariff wall between us and Canada is down, when Canada's crop fails our wheat growers may be benefited, and when our wheat crop fails that our consumers may be benefited by it; but shall we always be held between the upper and the nether millstones of extortionate prices on everything because some one interest may sometime in some slight degree be affected? If we can not start by giving our people free bread, when surely the great bulk of our wheat is priced by our surplus which goes abroad, where can we ever begin to stand for the forgotten man—the man who has nothing but his labor to sell, the man who needs protection? Who among our fathers who framed the Constitution forbidding export duties, willing that our riches might flow into all climes, and trusting that the natural riches of other lands might find welcome here, could have dreamed, when he walked through the primeval forests of oak and pine in this country, as I have done in my boyhood of days, gazing under the sheltering boughs of those vast giants with eyes searching the distant gloom through vistas resembling somewhat the pillared aisles of some ancient cathedral—who could have dreamed 30 years ago that the day would ever come when some vast monopolistic aggregation would gather into its control all the wealth and power of these great resources and would say to the people: "We will fix the price of the shelter over your head"? [Applause on the Democratic side.] God planted the trees, and sent the rain and the sunshine that made them grow. The Government gave away vast areas of land covered by the forests in bounties to railroads, and some—a lesser part—it sold at \$1.25 per acre, and these sold lands have been taken over, in the main, by the same stupendous combinations. And now these corporations, these magnates, these potentates, whose wealth puts to shame the heritage of emperors and kings, come to us and say: "It is true these lands, this timber, cost us little or nothing, but we ask that the Government put its arms around us and shield us and protect us, and, by a tax upon importation of lumber, make our timberlands worth, not \$10, or \$25, but \$50, \$100, or \$200 an acre." And all this we are asked in order that we might pour into the laps of those already overwealthy individuals, from the toil and bounty of the poor, untold, unnumbered, and immeasurable millions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCALL. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HUBBARD].

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Chairman, I find myself standing very much alone. I am the twelfth jurymen against the eleven obstinate fellows. I believe in this reciprocal agreement. I look for it to add to, not to detract from, the well-being of the United States. I come from a farming community. Our interests are agricultural. During the years that have immediately passed we have felt, in that country, that the tariff tax, as levied, has subverted the interests of a selfish few; that it meant nothing to us, but meant all to those from whom we had to buy.

I came here pledged and bound to a revision of the tariff downward. My party promised a revision of the tariff downward. Our people demanded it. They had no doubt and no question as to the direction in which their demand lay, as to whether it called for a revision upward or a revision downward. We acted upon the tariff. The Payne bill was the result. My people felt that such a result was a mockery and a failure.

We are called here by a Republican President for the purpose of redeeming, so far as we may, something of that failure.

For these many, many years the farmer has been the drawer of the chestnuts. We have been assured of protection to us when protection to us was, in the very nature of things, an impossibility, and in return we were expected to gather in the ring which disposed of the question of tariff duties, take our share of the loot, and keep our mouths shut. There is an open door offering that which we have sought, an effective revision of the tariff. I shall not hesitate to enter upon the path and follow it to the accomplishment of our purpose.

I do not care particularly to discuss the question whether the tariff on Canadian wheat or Canadian barley increases or leaves untouched the price of wheat and barley in the United States. It seems to me that when the surplus of Canada reaches the free paths of the ocean, and when the surplus of America reaches the free paths of the ocean, they stand there upon a level as to price. They pass to a common market and necessarily to a common price.

And as long as a surplus lasts so long of necessity, with exceptions here and there, must that market price be prevailing and controlling in this market as well as the other markets of the world. But what of it? But what if the price is raised here, what if the duty is added to bread? Can any man contend that the farmer is so poor and so hard pressed that this burden must be added to that of poverty? Are we, in the agricultural regions of these United States, in such miserable condition, as to our land and our labor, that we must, like a sick Caesar, cry to the protected interests: "Give me some drink, Titinius! Give me some drink."

If scarcity oppresses the land, is it to be thought of that we shall drive bread from our doors that some may profit while others starve? [Applause and laughter.]

Why, sir, what is the wonderful history of my country, of my State, if you please, almost the entire development of which I have seen within my brief lifetime? I drove over wild prairie into Iowa. The prairie fires had been raging. The country was a waste of blackness beneath, and as the night came on and the rain fell, looking upon it from the stagecoach, it was the "seat of desolation, void of light." The land was worth from \$1.25 to \$3 an acre, and \$10 was high. But immigration poured in from all the quarters of the world. Scandinavia sent her thousands and tens of thousands to us, and to-day it is a fenced-in land. There is no wilderness left in it. The land is worth from \$100 to \$200 an acre, and earns profit upon that price. And beyond us during all this time, the time of our great development, have lain the Dakotas.

I have seen the time when on one side of the Sioux River land would sell for \$40 an acre and \$50 an acre, while immediately across, in South Dakota, just as excellent land, bearing just as much, would not sell for to exceed \$12 to \$15 an acre. Dakota was there. Her lands rose in value as our lands filled. Her prices went up. Her lands became peopled. She is becoming a fenced-in land. To our detriment? No; to our blessing and to our benefit. We exchange one with the other, to and fro, across those State boundaries; her prosperity is our prosperity. The value of our lands has advanced in equal step with the development of Dakota.

So with Nebraska lying next to us. Did we lose anything by the prosperity of Nebraska? Where are conditions of farming most profitable, most sure? Where and when have they been best with us? In the pioneer days, on the edge of things, with wilderness beyond, or among peopled and developed States, cities, towns, market places? - Why, my friends who have

argued this question seem to think that because across the border from North Dakota, for instance, Canada is selling wheat for possibly 10 cents less than on our side of the line that somehow we are prospering, that somehow our wheat is made dearer because Canada's wheat is made cheaper. As if somewhere, somehow, it must not meet our grain in competition. The influence that to-day, more than all others, is contributing to the splendid growth and well-being of Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, is the rapid development of the great Northland. There they are no longer confronting an inhospitable waste, but a growing land filling with a friendly and kindred people. It is as sure as the course of nature that prosperity can not advance on one side of the line and not advance on the other, so long as wind blows and water runs.

We have gone through one experience in the restriction of commerce between these kindred lands. We had a heritage of forest sufficient for all time. I shall not rehearse the miserable story of blind destruction. Our supplies are approaching the end. On the Canada side are now almost immeasurable forests. We have forbidden our people to get their lumber from across the line. We have concentrated lumbering upon this side, and the result of the concentration is that it has gathered itself into a few powerful hands that hold the price in the market for lumber in their grasp and fix it at their pleasure. Our posterity for many generations will foot the bill for our folly. Do we wish to repeat the same process with food? We have been the most wasteful people that the world has known. Step by step in our 200 years or a little more of history we have moved across the land leaving it a waste behind us.

Here is Washington situated in the midst of a wilderness.

The land once covered by fertile plantations is now grown to woods. All New England has been swept over, the fertility of her soil taken from her and carried away. In Illinois and Iowa we no longer hear of the great returns per acre in wheat which once were common. When you sell a bushel of wheat, of necessity you sell some of the soil with it, unlike the cultivation of corn, clover, alfalfa, and the feeding of stock, leaving each acre the richer for use. Taking the United States as a whole, leaving out these momentary and local interests that may be affected for the instant by Canadian competition, can there be question as to the advantage of these United States in having this great body of wheat-bearing lands lying right along our northern border?

Why, they say the Canada lands are cheap. Not for long; not for long. History will rapidly repeat itself. The human tide has flowed irresistibly from shore to shore. It is but a few years when even the waste lands among us will be peopled and cultivated. They must be. Suppose some great convulsion of nature were to happen to-morrow and the fields of Canada should be severed from us, covered and destroyed as to all possibilities of cultivation. According to these people who are pleading against this treaty such a calamity would be the greatest good fortune that could come upon our country and to our people. This would make us prosperous, add millions to our wealth, because Canada could not then sell wheat in competition with us, either at home or abroad. [Applause.]

Our people are pouring into Canada. We could not keep our land-hungry folks out of such lands, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has described, with guns. We can not prevent this movement if we would. And why should we regret or resist? It is but a repetition of the historic flow of population that has developed the continent. Is it not an excellent and desirable thing that we should have friends and kinsfolk dwelling over the border and influencing the policy and commerce of our northern neighbor?

Who deems it a misfortune that Canada is there? Who would replace her fertile fields and busy millions with waste and solitude?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to yield to anyone else?

Mr. McCALL. Not at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how the division of time stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 10 hours and 45 minutes, including the time allowed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has used 10 hours and 3 minutes.

Mr. MANN. In reference to the time charged to the gentleman from Alabama, does that include all of the 5 hours allotted to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has used 3 hours and 10 minutes, and the total time, including that, is 10 hours and 45 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. So there is 42 minutes difference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to have the time evened up on the two sides to-night before we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. There is 43 minutes difference in favor of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration a proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada, the same proposition that was up for consideration by this House in February last, during the third session of the Sixty-first Congress. At that time I submitted some remarks against the proposed treaty, and I wish to-day to briefly make some additions thereto.

The speeches that I have so far heard upon the subject here in the House have been largely along the lines as to the effect the proposed treaty will have upon the consumers of the country and upon the manufacturing interests. I wish to speak more directly as to the effect I believe it will have upon the farmers, especially the farmers of the Northern States from Maine to Washington.

The State of North Dakota, which I have the honor of representing in part here in Congress, is purely an agricultural State. The 350 miles of its northern boundary is bounded by the southern boundaries of the great Canadian Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Within the last three months I have received from farmers and business men of my State signed protests exceeding thirty-five hundred in number, protesting against the ratification of this proposed treaty. The great majority of these protests have been signed by farmers themselves, and I have only had five communications from my State asking or suggesting that I should support this proposed treaty. The farmers in North Dakota know from actual personal knowledge the difference between the prices which they receive for their grain upon the American side and the prices which the Canadian farmers receive upon the Canadian side of the line. I stated last February that at the town of Portal, on December 31, 1910—and that was before there was any talk of Canadian reciprocity—wheat was worth there that day 86 cents a bushel; across the street in North Portal, which is in Canada, wheat that same day was worth 75 cents a bushel. Barley that day at Portal was worth 63 cents, and at North Portal, across the street, it was worth 35 cents. Flax that day was worth in Portal \$2.33, and at North Portal, across the street, it was worth \$1.89. (These figures were furnished by the American customhouse officer.) The wheat that is raised upon both the Canadian and American sides of the line is exactly the same kind of wheat.

The grades run the same and the freight rates to Minneapolis, Duluth, Fort William, and Winnipeg are the same. The tariff and the tariff alone gives the American farmer the larger price. There is no argument that can be advanced by any man upon the floor of this House that will convince the farmer living in the border States and who knows the difference in the prices of his products upon this side of the line and the prices for products upon the Canadian side of the line that this Canadian reciprocity agreement is a good thing for him.

There has been much said as to the price of wheat in Chicago, Minneapolis, and Winnipeg. The wheat that is marketed in Chicago is not the kind of wheat that is raised in the Canadian Provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba and the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota. The quotations on Chicago wheat are entirely for what is known as soft winter wheat. No. 2 red is, I believe, the contract grade. The only States that produce spring wheat, from which the patent flour is made in any quantity, are the spring-wheat States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the wheat that is produced in the Canadian Provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan is the identical same kind of wheat. This spring wheat is a very hard, flinty wheat and makes the very best of flour, and naturally brings a somewhat higher price than the soft winter wheat; and, in fact, quite a large quantity of this spring wheat is used for the purpose of mixing with the winter wheat and thereby raising the quality of the flour made from winter wheat. There is practically no spring wheat exported from this country, but it is almost all used here in the United States. Six years ago the Province of Saskatchewan produced about 5,000,000 bushels of wheat, now they produce over 90,000,000 bushels; the production of oats has increased from 1,500,000 bushels to over 60,000,000 bushels; barley increased from less than 200,000 bushels to nearly 8,000,000 bushels; flax increased from nothing to over 4,000,000 bushels; and the production of wheat, oats, barley, and flax in Manitoba and Alberta is going up by leaps and bounds.

In the summers in the Canadian northwest the days are extremely long, and the same is true to a somewhat less extent in Minnesota and the Dakotas. In the city of Fargo, in which I live, in the summertime a person can see to read out of doors at 9 o'clock in the evening. The daylight and twilight continues even longer as we go farther north. The consequence is that the isothermal line extends a long way to the north and it is possible to mature grain in this northern country in a very short time. Wheat sown in April is harvested early in August; oats sown in May are harvested at the same time; barley sown in May is harvested the last of July; flax sown the 1st of June is harvested the 1st of September. I have traveled extensively over the Canadian northwest and have seen its millions of acres of virgin soil, much of it as yet untouched by the plow of the farmer, and I realize its possibilities. It is capable of producing wheat, oats, flax, and barley in great abundance, and this vast country, as yet in its infancy in the production of grain, will, with the admission of Canadian grains into the United States free of duty, have the effect of lowering the prices that are now received by the American farmer for grain of a similar character all over this country.

The early part of this month there was a State convention held in the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the purpose of protesting against this Canadian reciprocity agreement. Every county throughout the State, some 50 of them, held county conventions and regularly elected delegates to attend this State convention. It was attended by some 1,200 to 1,500 delegates from all parts of the State, men who were representative farmers and business men, to enter their protest against this proposed treaty. They passed the following set of resolutions by a unanimous vote:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

We, the farmers and business men of North Dakota in convention assembled, protest against the ratification by the Congress of the United States of the pending trade agreement with Canada. In view of this attitude the following declarations were unanimously adopted:

1. That it is unfair and unjust to the agricultural interests, offering to them no semblance of reciprocal equivalent in return for what it purposes to give.
2. That it will bring suffering and disaster to a very large number of our producers, with no hope that the price of bread will be lowered to the consumer.
3. That the duty on barley will accrue in benefit solely to the brewer, incurring great loss to the producer.
4. That it places our farmers in the position of competing in our own home markets with an alien people, upon conditions most advantageous to our competitors.
5. That the Canadian producer, with his cheaper land, requires smaller investment, making the per bushel cost of his product much less than ours.
6. That it "blazes the way" for the emigration of thousands of our people and millions of our wealth to a foreign field.
7. That it will reduce farm values, increasing the burden of the debtor, destroy incentive for the greater development of farm production, and lure to alien benefit untold millions of our wealth that should and would accrue to this and future generations if employed in the development of those vast untitled acres that lie between the Mississippi River and the Pacific within our own borders.
8. That it will lower the standard of farm life, reducing it to one of drudgery, lessen the opportunities for the better education of farm children, and drive from instead of encouraging them to remain on the farm.
9. That it will lessen the purchasing power of our own producers, and by so doing the commercial interests will suffer a greater loss than can possibly be overcome by any gain in trade with Canada.
10. That in trading our home markets of over 90,000,000 people (markets that are abundantly supplied by our own producers, markets that have been largely made and earned, and which, by right and heritage, belong to our own producers) for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantage to the commercial and manufacturing interests, is not only unfair and unjust, but reprehensible.

These resolutions express the sentiments of over 100,000 American farmers living in the State of North Dakota.

Recently I had a letter from Mr. C. B. McMillan, of my State, who lives within 5 miles of the Canadian boundary line. He writes me "that every farmer and every business man on the American side is against the proposed treaty." He states that "every farmer and every business man across the line on the Canadian side are for it." Let me ask, Are we, the Members of Congress of the United States, legislating to help our own people or the people of Canada?

I also have a letter from Mr. Frank H. Dickinson, of Ayr, N. Dak., a man who has lived in my State for 30 years, and who is one of its most prosperous farmers. He has written me within the week that he intends to sell every acre of his North Dakota land. He says that he believes that this treaty will go through; that it will have the effect of lowering the prices of land, and that he had better get out now while he can get out at a fair price; and then he adds further on in his letter, "land is cheap in Canada; I will go up there and invest." Another farmer writes me, and his letter was received yesterday, and says:

The proposed reciprocity treaty is the burning question in North Dakota. I congratulate you and the delegation in Congress from North

Dakota for the position you have taken against it. Everyone in the State, Republicans and Democrats, farmers and business men alike, are bitterly opposed to the ratification of the treaty.

I have had hundreds of letters on this subject, and the ones quoted are fair samples of them all. I do not believe that if we go from Maine to California, throughout any of our northern States, we will find one farmer out of a hundred who is in favor of this reciprocity treaty. For 350 miles North Dakota borders upon Canada. Through the northern half of the State the Great Northern Railroad from St. Paul to Seattle crosses the State. Running north in North Dakota from the main line of the railroad to the Canadian line are 12 branch lines of the Great Northern Railroad, and only three of them cross over into Canada at the present time.

The rest of them run up to within a mile, or 4 or 5 miles, of the boundary line and stop. The reason they stop there is because of the tariff wall that now exists between the United States and Canada. Remove that tariff wall and this railroad will immediately push its branches across into Canada and bring down the Canadian wheat, oats, flax, barley, cattle, and everything else in competition with the farmers of this country.

I see many of the Manitoba and some of the Saskatchewan Canadian papers, and they are without exception heartily in favor of this proposed treaty, believing that it will raise the price of their lands by the influx of Americans into their country and by opening up to them the great markets of the United States. My understanding as to the right way to increase the trade of a country by reciprocity is to trade something we have and which the other country does not have for something they have and which we do not have, and I believe that is true reciprocity. For instance: The United States uses a very large amount of coffee. We buy it largely from Brazil, and it is imported to this country entirely free of duty. We could enter into a trade agreement with Brazil, with the understanding that we would continue to allow their coffee to come in free of duty, and they to make concessions to us for things we produce or manufacture and which they do not produce or manufacture. This would be true reciprocity. But, under this proposed treaty, we are entering into an agreement with an agricultural people—for Canada manufactures but little—and we intend to bring the 8,000,000 Canadian people, who are largely interested in agriculture, into direct conflict and competition with our own agricultural people and in the very same line of products.

In the speech which was made last Saturday by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] he stated the facts clearly and plainly; showed that while the United States at the present time, at least, was importing but little butter from Canada, yet at the same time Canada was exporting millions of pounds of butter to England. Naturally, if the tariff between the United States and Canada is removed, the distance being so much less and the freight rates so much lower, instead of shipping her butter to England she would ship to the United States, and the same analysis would apply to every other agricultural product.

I wish to quote the price of wheat on Thursday, April 13, 1911. No. 1 northern at Winnipeg was 89½ cents; No. 1 northern at Minneapolis was 98½ cents. This is exactly the same kind of wheat—hard spring wheat in both cases. Flax at Winnipeg was worth \$2.30 and flax in Minneapolis was worth \$2.54. Would these figures indicate that the tariff was of no benefit to the farmers of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, I am bitterly opposed to this proposed treaty. I consider it a one-sided treaty, and that Canada has a long way the best of the bargain. If it is ratified, it strikes the farmers of this country a deadly blow. It means that everything the farmer produces is placed on the free list, except wool—and that, I understand, is to go next. Free raw material seems to be the cry, and the farmer, producing nothing, it is said, but raw material, although to him, at least, that which he produces is the finished product, must suffer. For years the American farmer has been led to believe that a protective tariff was best for the development and building up of this country, and I have so believed and have so maintained, and I believe so now, where all interests and all classes are treated alike. The American farmer has been told that when the time came that the American people consumed the products of the farms that then the tariff would be of real and direct help to him. That time has now arrived. At the present time we are not producing any more barley than we consume; we are not raising as much flax as we consume; our wheat exports are dwindling down, and within the next four or five years we will no longer be an exporter of wheat; we are practically using all of the cattle we produce in this country, and the same is true as to butter, eggs, potatoes, and all farm produce; and the day has arrived when the tariff upon farm products is a

real benefit to the farmer. But now, when this time has arrived and when the opportunity has come for the farmer to get a fair price for the products and the things he produces, then the tariff, which is to help him, is to be wiped out entirely.

Under this proposed treaty wheat is placed on the free list, but a duty is left on flour; barley is placed on the free list, but a duty is left on barley malt; flax is placed on the free list, but a duty is left on linseed oil; cattle are placed on the free list, but a duty is left on beef. Where is the justice or the equity in a proposition of this kind? Who has put the larger amount of time and labor into any one of these articles—the farmer, who produces the wheat, barley, flax, and cattle, or the miller, the maltster, the crusher of flaxseed, and the packer? And who is most fairly entitled to a reasonable amount of protection? There is but one answer, and that is that right and justice are upon the side of the farmer, and as far as lies within my power I shall do my best to see that he gets a square deal.

The farmer will not stand to have his products placed on the free list and be content that the manufacturer alone shall have protection. The people have complained as to the high cost of living, but the high cost of living has not been caused by reason of the price that the farmers have been receiving for their products. The trouble has been, and is, that the high cost of living has been caused by combinations and monopolies, high freight rates and express rates, which have been and are between the producer and the consumer. This proposed bill will not in anywise affect any trust or combination which exists for the purpose of raising prices, but will really help them by giving them all farm products free of duty. Farmers' organizations have been started. We have the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance, the American Society of Equity, and others, and the time is not distant when the farmers will rise up in their might and will form an organization that will sweep over this country, and they will demand and will get their just rights.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in a fair protective policy—protection that shall apply equally to all sections of the country, to all classes, and to all people. This proposed treaty strikes at the very foundation of the great principle of protection, which has been the solid rock upon which the Republican Party has stood for half a century and upon which it has had the confidence of the American people. Let us stand together now as Republicans, true to our time-honored principles, and vote against this bill; and if it must go through this House, let it go through by Democratic votes and as a Democratic measure, for that is what I believe it to be. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt in the minds of those of us who have read the statements made by representatives of farm organizations before the committees, or who have read the editorials of farm journals, or who have heard the speeches of Members representing agricultural States, as to what the American farmer thinks of this proposed pact with Canada. He is against it, so far and as fast as he is informed of its real provisions, of its total disregard of sound economic principle, of its total disregard of moral standards, and of its utter lack of the spirit of the square deal.

NO BENEFITS FOR THE FARMER.

The representatives of the American farmer have made it clear that so far as benefits to him are concerned in this tariff measure they are Utopian, imaginary, fantastical. They do not exist. But, so far as burdens are concerned, they are only too real and threaten to become heavy and grievous to bear.

THE BARB-WIRE BUBBLE.

When the masters of the National Grange of many Eastern States first sounded a note of warning to the farmers of this country Secretary Wilson was sent East to make a speech so as to allay the farmer's fears. The great benefit to the American farmer that he found in this treaty was free barb wire. The American farmer may be naturally slow, possibly credulous, and yet he is no man's dupe. He proceeds to look into this alleged benefit. What does he find? He finds it ridiculous to suggest that a saving in the small amount of barb wire used to fence a field or two for cattle would be any offset to his losses. Moreover, he finds that Canada does not produce barb wire, and certainly not in such quantities as to affect the American price of barb wire the least fraction of a cent. He finds that Canada has barb wire on the free list and imported last year over 96,000,000 pounds of wire from the United States. This importation has reached as high as 114,000,000 pounds of wire a year. So this benefit of free barb wire turns out to be a bubble that upon examination bursts and vanishes into thin air. But in the mind of the American farmer Secretary Wilson suffered on this same barb wire a severe rent in the trousers of his reputation which it will take him some time to mend.

FREE LUMBER A GOLD BRICK.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. My time is limited, but I will answer a question.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether in his investigations the farmer made any discoveries with reference to lumber.

Mr. NELSON. He did. The next alleged benefit that was claimed for the farmer was free lumber. So the farmer set to work to find out what benefit there is in that item. Being somewhat suspicious on account of barbed wire, he expected to find in it knots and slivers for him. And so he did. The lumber he does not use in any quantity—the rough lumber—is on the free list, but the lumber he does use—shingles, boards tongued and grooved—are taxed in this treaty. But suppose that the benefit of the average reduction made in the tariff on lumber that he does use gets by Jim Hill's railway freight charges, through the benevolent associations of retail lumbermen, and reaches his pocketbook in safety, what would be the amount of saving when he comes to build a new house once in 40 or 50 years? Any old farmer can figure out in his head that this saving, if it got to him, would not exceed \$10 or \$15. So that this benefit from free lumber turns out to amount to 10, 15, or possibly 20 cents a year as an offset to his losses. Now, the farmer may be slow, credulous, and wear long whiskers, but he is no man's fool. He knows when some one is attempting to work off on him gold bricks.

MOONSHINE MARKETS.

Thereupon the farmers were told of the free markets of Canada for small fruits and vegetables. The farmer takes down his geography to look for these markets of Canada to which he may send his small fruits and vegetables and expect a reasonable profit after he has paid the freight. But he does not find them. They are Utopian. They do not exist. As well might these gentlemen go to the icemen of America and point out the profitable markets of Iceland for ice, or go to the coal men and suggest to them the markets of hades for coal. The farmer knows as well as anybody that his home markets are far to be preferred. He can not be fooled into the belief that he can profit by carrying coal to Newcastle. The farmer may be slow and credulous, but he knows as well as anyone else when some one is attempting to hand him a lemon.

FARM LOSSES REAL.

But while his benefits in this pact are imaginary, his losses are real. The representatives of the American farmer made it clear before committees that now when consumption had overtaken production and he stood to gain from the tariff his relief from Canadian competition is to be taken away from him. They also made it clear that his losses would come to him in three forms.

FALLING PRICES.

These representatives called attention to the falling prices in the crops now on hand. Gentlemen for the treaty may shut their eyes and their ears to the abundance of evidence that exists of its probable effect upon prices, but the farmer knows what is taking place to-day. At the very suggestion of the passage of this pact he suffers a severe loss in present prices. He knows what has happened to the wheat, barley, oats, hay, and dairy products. He asks himself, If this is the effect before its passage, what will be the result when this pact shall have become a certainty? Who can estimate the loss in dollars and cents to the American farmer that comes to him in the falling prices of crops now on hand?

DECREASED CROP VALUES.

But a more serious loss will come to him in the decrease of the average value of his crops per acre annually. The representatives of farm organizations, who know farm statistics, who know the cost of production of every crop, who know from bitter experience the effect of an oversupply in the markets, assert with intense conviction that when this Canadian competition shall be a fact, when the Canadian farmer with his special benefits, which, in general terms, they point out as consisting of greater farm areas, cheaper lands, fertile virgin soil, lower taxes, lower-priced farm labor, cheaper manufactured articles plus farm implements, plus the necessities and comforts of life under the favorable trade relations between Canada and England, and generally a much lower standard of living; when the Canadian farmer shall have free access upon equal tariff terms to American markets in competition with the American farmer, who would suffer under these special disadvantages; smaller farms requiring intensified farming, higher priced lands, the investment required having doubled the last 10 years, worn-out soils, either producing smaller yields per acre or requiring more labor and fertilization, and rotation of crops and years of fallowness,

higher and growing taxes, higher wages of farm hands that have increased 60 per cent in 10 years, 45 to 60 per cent tax on manufactured articles plus farm implements now protected by high tariff walls, the necessities and comforts of life, here controlled by monopolies which levy tribute at will, and, finally, the cost of production 50 to 100 per cent above 10 years ago and a much higher prevailing standard of living; when this Canadian farmer, numbering millions, shall flood American markets with his products, the effect must be inevitably a decrease in the average value of American farm crops of at least \$1.50, probably \$2, and possibly \$3 per acre annually. Who can estimate in dollars and cents this annual loss in the lessening values of his crops per acre that may come to the American farmer as a result of this Canadian pact?

WISCONSIN HIT HARD.

Such States as Wisconsin, it is asserted, will be hit hard by this treaty. Farmers fear that it will probably ruin the barley market and at times greatly affect prices on potatoes, oats, cattle, sheep, hogs, cheese, and dairy products.

TUMBLING VALUES OF FARM LANDS.

But the most serious loss, they fear, is tumbling values of farm lands. As a basis upon which to ground this point, I will read a few lines of testimony by Prof. Atkeson, of West Virginia, before the Senate Committee on Finance. Prof. Atkeson testified, in part, as follows:

I am a practical farmer and a teacher of agriculture in our agricultural college. I have been dean of the agricultural college for a good many years. A good many years ago, when I was younger than I am now, I was a laborer on a Kanawha Valley farm that I still own and operate. That land was selling in the fifties, when I was a boy, at \$100 an acre. Soon after the construction of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, which reached Charleston from the farms of the West, that land could not be sold for \$35 an acre. Lands that had sold 20 or 30 years previously, before the Civil War, at \$100 an acre suddenly dropped to about \$35 an acre, because all the lands of the West were brought into competition with this Kanawha Valley land in West Virginia.

What I saw as a boy in the Kanawha Valley, in bringing into competition with that fertile valley the fertile fields of the West, this country will see and feel to a greater extent when we open the fertile, cheap lands of Canada to competition with these higher-priced lands of America. That is as certain as that twice 2 make 4. I do not know to what extent, I do not know how much, it will affect the price of wheat, but I feel absolutely certain that the opening of those cheaper lands to competition with ours must affect seriously the agricultural interests of the country.

Now, this dean of the college of agriculture was stating, from an abundance of experience and knowledge, what every man knows who is at all familiar with the history of agriculture in this country.

A WARNING FROM EXPERIENCE.

What he says of West Virginia was equally true of all North Atlantic States. With the development of the West, where lands were cheap and wild and homesteads free, with the building of the transcontinental railroads, which put the products of these western farms into eastern markets in competition with the products of the high-priced lands of the East, what were the consequences? The eastern farmer took the life out of his farm. He wore the soil to the bone, so to speak, in striving to meet that competition. But it would not avail him. The prices of farm values in the East fell, fell, and fell, until they reached the bottom, where they remained stagnant for about 30 years. There they remained until the West had settled up, until the farms of the West were taken up even in the arid and semiarid regions, until the prices of farm lands became so high that population commenced to drift back East and South, buying up these abandoned farms. Of recent years farming in New York, in New England, and in the Virginias has been picking up. There is now a fair living to be made out of these old farms, and with proper fertilization some profit. The equilibrium between East and West has nearly been restored. But when you now tear down, as you propose to do, the tariff wall between the American farmer and the Canadian farmer, what will be the effect? The dean of the agricultural college, out of his experience and knowledge, has stated the farmers' view. The effect of Canadian competition, he asserts, must be that the farm lands East and West will fall in value precisely as formerly the East fell in competition with the West.

A LONG PERIOD OF STAGNATION.

To what extent they will fall no one can foresee. How long this condition will exist no one can know. It is probable that stagnation will exist until Canada, like the West, shall be populated, all agricultural lands developed, the prices of farm lands in Canada equal prices in America, and general conditions in both countries assume a standard of equality. But in the meantime, basing our experience on what happened in this country and what has happened under like conditions in every country in the world, who can estimate the loss in dollars and cents that may come to the American farmers through this unspeakable folly?

FARMERS' SENSE OF RIGHT AND WRONG OUTRAGED.

But the farmer is not opposed to this pact from material motives merely. It is not with him wholly a question of money. His sense of right and wrong has been outraged.

REAL RECIPROCITY HELPFUL.

At first these words, Canadian reciprocity, fell upon his ears with a pleasant sound. Reciprocity was suggestive to him of the golden rule. It was symbolic of all that is fair, equitable, and just in the dealings of the people of one country with the people of another country. He had not forgotten past Republican platforms. He remembers more or less distinctly the speeches of American statesmen, notably McKinley and Blaine, on reciprocity. He had no fear of any harm, for it meant merely reciprocal arrangements between these two countries in tariffs on noncompeting products. He thought of it something like this: Canada will send over to us some things that we need but do not produce, or do not produce in sufficient quantities, and we will send to Canada that which Canadians need and do not produce in sufficient quantities. Thus no industry will be injured in either country and no class discriminated against, but there will be mutual benefit and service to the people of both countries. He never dreamed of a treaty going beyond noncompeting products, because the moment it does so he can see, as anybody can see, that of necessity favoritism comes into play. Some industry and class will be selected for losses, other industries and classes will be selected for increased profits. Thus the very spirit of reciprocity is destroyed. The farmer's dream was over when he found what this pact really contained. He found in it discrimination against him of the rankest sort.

NOT RIGHT BUT MIGHT.

"By what moral or ethical rule of right have they measured out to me my portion of probable losses?" he asks. "By what ethical standard of right have they selected my products for free trade? What right had they to cheapen the labor of my arm and my brain so as to give raw material to the manufacturer, to relieve him of the payment of tariff revenues to Canada, and to help him to enlarge Canadian markets at my expense? By what standard of ethics was the right or wrong in any of these 250 items determined? By what standard of right and wrong were any of these decreases or increases of tariff rates established?"

To these questions there has been given, there can be given, but one reply—the framers of this pact were evidently not at all disturbed over questions of right and wrong. They had the arbitrary power to make what selections they pleased. Nothing in this pact is clearer than that there was no consideration had of questions of right; it was wholly a matter of might.

TRUTH NOT WANTED.

Moral standards of right having been disregarded, what effort was made to avoid error and to ascertain the truth? The farmer is entitled to know the facts.

"What light was had upon the items of this treaty?" he asks his Representative in Congress.

We answer, "None whatever."

"But did you not have a Tariff Board, to which a quarter of a million dollars of appropriations had been made, whose duty it was to supply you with these facts?"

"We had, but the Tariff Board was not consulted in the preparation of this pact. After the treaty had passed the House a Senate resolution by Senator CUMMINS called upon the Tariff Board for facts. Thereupon the board reported, but the facts furnished in no way sustained the President's argument for the treaty. Instead, it strikingly proves the injustice done by it to the farmers of the country."

"Did not some committee investigate the facts with reference to these items?"

"No," we reply. "Members of the Ways and Means Committee repeatedly stated upon the floor of the House that this treaty was prepared by some person in the diplomatic service, no investigation was had by the committee, and no detailed statement of facts furnished as to any item in the treaty. All testimony taken before the committee was given against it, with the single exception of the newspaper representative, who frankly stated that the newspapers wanted this pact, because it would give them free wood pulp and print paper. The newspaper association represented by him, he argued, would thus save \$6,000,000 a year in the cost of print paper."

THE INTERESTS FAVORED BY THE PACT.

"What are the favored interests in this treaty?" the farmer wishes to know.

We reply: "The Beef Trust seems a great favorite. Cattle on the hoof are put on the free list, but meats are taxed 14 cents per pound. The flour combine is another favorite. It gets free wheat, but secures a tax of 50 cents a barrel on flour.

Automobiles are given reduced rates into Canada. This looks like a gift to the General Motors Co., the automobile combine. Automobile manufacturers, at any rate, will save about \$80,000 a year in Canadian customs duties. Printers' supplies are in the treaty for reduced rates. This seems to be in the interest of the American Type Foundry Co., which is the so-called Printers' Trust. Aluminum is in the treaty for reduced rates. The American Aluminum Co. is a perfect trust. It has a plant in Canada, but has no rival either there or in the United States. Biscuits are in the treaty. This seems for the benefit of the Biscuit Trust. Fruit products are in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. This may be for the benefit of the Canned Fruit Trust. Bituminous coal is in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. There can hardly be any doubt as to this being in the interest of the Coal Trust. It will save at least \$450,246 a year in customs duties to Canada that will hereafter be remitted. Condensed milk is in the treaty. This seems to be in the interest of the Condensed Milk Trust. Cottonseed oil is in the treaty. Clearly this is for the benefit of the Cottonseed Oil Trust, which is given free Canadian markets. This trust will thus save annually the sum of \$179,138 that it paid Canada last year in customs duties. Articles of glass, of leather, and of brass are in the pact for reduced rates into Canada. This is probably in the interest of the Glass Trust, the Smelter Trust, and the Leather Trust. Iron ore is in the treaty for reduced rates. This may be for the benefit of independent steel companies, but more likely it is in the interest of the Steel Trust. Cement is in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. This is likely to be in the interest of the cement combine. Farm implements are in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. This seems clearly in the interest of Morgan's International Harvester Co., which gets reduced rates into Canada for farm machinery of all kinds, and saves at least \$100,000 a year in Canadian customs duties—thanks to this proposed pact."

FAVORITISM AND POWER.

"But how in the name of common sense," asks the now indignant farmer, "were these items selected anyway?"

We do not know, but we can form an opinion from the facts that have come to our attention. We find, for example, that cream separators are singled out from all the machinery used in butter making and placed upon the free list. The creamery separator companies directly charge in their circular literature that this industry was discriminated against through the influence of a prominent Canadian senator. A member of the Ways and Means Committee stated that he had requested that grindstones be included in the treaty. From such facts it is easy to infer that when these diplomats representing the United States met with the diplomats representing Canada they favored their friends, their home interests, and political ends; they bargained with each other behind closed doors; and after the exercise of diplomatic ingenuity, skill, and political wire-pulling the items, industries, and classes in this treaty were finally agreed upon, some for probable losses and some for probable gains. Certainly the whole transaction smacks of rank favoritism.

THE GENERAL WELFARE DISREGARDED.

"But was there no consideration had," the farmer asks again, "as to the probable effect of this pact upon the well-being of the American people?"

NOT THE WELL-BEING OF THE FARMER.

The reply must be that a study of the pact reveals clearly that no thought was taken whatever of the well-being, the prosperity, and the good will of the American farmer. He gets no benefit out of it whatever, but stands to lose in every possible way.

NOT THE WELL-BEING OF THE CONSUMER.

Nor will the consumer profit by it. Common sense and a careful study of the treaty will convince anyone of the fact, admitted on both sides of this Chamber, that the reduction made in tariff rates on the farmers' food products will not affect the cost of living to the consumer. He will be the most disappointed of mankind, if he expects to buy his bread, milk, meats, and beer any cheaper than he does now.

The 10 or 15 cents lost by the farmer on a bushel of wheat is not likely to get by the railroad companies, but if it should it will be less likely to get by the Flour Combine, but if it should it will not get by the baker. A loaf of bread will not be changed either in price or size. The loss the farmer suffers on his cattle is not like to get by the transportation companies, but if it should it will hardly get by the Beef Trust, but if it does it will not get by the butcher. The price and size of the pound of meat will not be changed a particle for the consumer. The loss to the farmer in the price of barley will not get by the

railroad companies, but if it does it will not get by the brewer, and certainly it will not escape the saloon keeper. The price of a glass of beer will not be less for thirsty throats.

That the consumer will gain nothing by the passage of this pact is so certain that no Member of this House has dared to assert that it would cheapen the cost of living. The farmers' losses will be absorbed by the middlemen, who now get 65 cents to his 35 cents out of every dollar the consumer pays for food. The consumer expects bread, but he will get a bone.

THE MANUFACTURING INTERESTS WILL GAIN.

The manufacturing and monopoly interests will gain in three ways: The Beef Trust, the Flour Combine, the Steel Trust, and other interests will get raw material free, or at reduced rates from Canada. These interests are relieved entirely of payment of customs duties to Canada or given greatly reduced rates. In the case of the Coal Trust, this amounts to nearly \$500,000 a year, and, moreover, these privileged interests secure Canadian markets for themselves in return for American markets to Canadian farmers.

NOT PRINCIPLE BUT FORCE.

This treaty, therefore, is not based upon any economic principle, nor is it in accord with any ethical rule of right, and is wholly lacking in the spirit of the square deal. It is what law always comes to be when enacted by a combination of special interests—the expression of brute force and of arbitrary power. That and nothing more.

POWER BACK OF PACT.

Will the House pass this pact? Undoubtedly. There is back of it a combination of irresistible power. The President is back of it with all the power of his great office. The Democratic Party, except 12 Representatives from farm districts, is back of this bill solidly, especially from the South, and party leaders frankly and consistently state that they are for it for two purposes: They desire the overthrow of the entire protective system and the defeat of the Republican Party at the polls in the coming Presidential election. The big daily newspapers are back of this treaty, because this pact gives them free wood pulp and print paper. And, finally, there is back of this treaty most of the Representatives in Congress from New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and all the large cities, whose constituents mistakenly hold the farmers responsible for the high cost of living. Such is the combination of power that is about to run the steam roller over the American farmer.

FARMER RESENTS UNFAIR TREATMENT.

Now, the farmer resents this treatment of him as a class. He has the self-respect of a just and honorable man, and this discrimination touches his pride keenly. His hands may be callous, but his heart is not, nor his head. The American farmer asks only for a square deal. Why should he suffer such unfair discrimination? How has he deserved it? Certainly not from his own political party.

BACKBONE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The American farmer has been the backbone of the Republican Party all these years. Cities might go Democratic, but when the votes were counted in the rural districts it was found that the farmer had saved the day. He has been the patient pack horse of protection, because he believed what the campaign orators told him repeatedly upon the stump, that he was getting relief from Canadian competition in American markets.

GRUMBLED AT THE ALDRICH BILL.

It is true that he grumbled when the overloaded Aldrich bill was placed upon his broad back, but even then he did not kick over the traces entirely on the protective principle. He still believed that he had his portion of relief from competition with the only country on earth that he had any cause to fear. His surprise may therefore be readily imagined when President Taft, contrary to his pledge in the Republican platform, proposed a pact that removes entirely the farmer's protection from competition with Canada. In his message the President, in effect, asserts that the American farmer has been the pack horse of protection all these years for nothing.

Unfortunately this announcement comes to the American farmer when relief from Canadian competition would be of real benefit to him, because now consumption has overtaken production East and West; it comes to him at a time when the farmer's vote is no longer dominant at the polls, because 55 per cent of the population of this country now live in the large cities of the land; it comes at a time when the abuse, the perversion, the misapplication of a great economic principle has so outraged public sentiment that it calls for a scapegoat. So the farmer is selected as the sacrificial victim to suffer for the wrongs done by those privileged interests, who even in this pact profit by his misfortunes.

THE FARMER WILL DEFEND HIMSELF.

These privileged interests may well beware lest they plague him beyond all patience. Shorn of his once kingly strength, there is yet remaining to the American farmer the strength of Samson, and Samsonlike he may some day pull down the whole tariff temple over the heads of privileged interests. Surely the Republican Party can not support free trade for the farm and protection for the factory. "A house divided against itself can not stand." Hereafter the farmer will demand protection for every industry alike or free trade for all.

LOYAL TO HIS COUNTRY.

The farmer is loyal to his country. He has faith in Government. He believes that law must represent justice to all classes alike. He is therefore keenly hurt at the thought that the farmer class should thus be discriminated against. What justification is there? The farmer is in no trust. His industry is the one in which there is still full and free competition. He does not declare dividends quarterly. His margin of profit is at most 2½ to 3 per cent on his investment. As a rule he gets little more out of his year's labor and the labor of his wife and children than a fair living for himself and family. There has been no rush from the cities to the farms. The farmer can not strike for an eight-hour day. He works eight hours—but, as has been said, eight hours before noon and eight hours after noon. He risks his year's toil on wind and weather, heat and cold, bugs, worms, pestilence, and politics. As he sees it, this pact will but increase the per cent of mortgaged lands and of farm tenants.

THE REAL PRODUCER.

The farmer feels hurt at this proposed injustice, because he knows he is the real producer of wealth in this country. Farm investments represent twice the value of the investment of manufactures. The farmer has produced 75 per cent of the Nation's wealth. He is the producer of necessities of life, and to discourage him is to reduce the purchasing power of 45 per cent of the population. Is not this a government for the greatest good of the greatest number?

ROOSEVELT REVERSED.

The farmer feels hurt at this injustice, because he knows that he is the salt of the land. Upon the farms must be reared the strong men and women, physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually, that shall be the salvation of this Nation in the future. He knows the danger of centralized population in the great cities. He is familiar with the story of ancient Rome. He knows the history of the decay of nations. Why this sudden reversal of a great national policy? What of the Roosevelt Farm Commission and its purpose of making a happy, contented, and prosperous people upon the farms of this country? What of the appropriations of millions yearly to encourage agriculture? Why, now, strike this body blow at the American farmer?

CONCLUSION.

Gentlemen advocating this treaty profess to believe that these fears and forebodings of the representatives of the American farmer will prove unfounded. Fervently we hope and pray that this may be true. But whatever the future may have in store it is certain that the farmer has nothing to gain by this pact and everything to lose. As a trade this treaty is a farce. Canada gives up revenues amounting to \$2,500,000; America gives up revenues amounting to \$5,000,000. The American farmers are given Canadian markets of only 8,000,000 people, but the Canadian farmers are given the American markets of 92,000,000 of people.

In short, Mr. Chairman, from the farmers' point of view, this pact is not only a bad bargain, but most unfair when tested by every moral standard and utterly lacking in the spirit of the square deal.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, have I 15 or 17 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining. Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, being a new Member, I sat in my place during all the sessions of this term and listened closely to the several debates. Due modesty, as expected from a first term, would probably require me to sit in eloquent silence throughout this discussion, but I represent a district essentially agricultural, in which all the sources of my people's thrift are to be affected by the final disposition of this bill.

I heard the delightful three hours' entertainment furnished by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and I wish that my constituents could have seen and heard it. Then came the Member from Maine, worthy successor of Thomas B. Reed, the greatest Speaker of the nineteenth century, and James G. Blaine, that unsurpassed statesman of any age. Blaine gave

us the name of the proposition here this day discussed, and I believe that if living they would indorse the doctrine so well voiced by Maine's eloquent son. I do not think either would indorse the substance of the proposition before us to-day. As I was taught reciprocity it was to be the sword of commerce, companion to protection, the shield. And while it might be used as a weapon of offense and even conquest, it should never be perverted into the suicidal blade.

That speech of the new Member from Maine and the several other Members leave anything more than a fragmentary discussion unnecessary. The first days' proceedings of this bill will leave little question in the minds of the country why Maine, smaller in size, less fertile in soil, and younger in history, has and does still exert a more powerful influence upon the times, the Nation, and the world than North Carolina.

The proposition before this House is one vouched for by the President of the United States. That is the best thing that can be said of it. That is also, to my mind, the worst thing that can be said of the President. That my attitude may be thoroughly understood, let me say, I regard our President as the best equipped chief magistrate who ever graced the presidential chair. To his great heart, big brain, ripened judgment, and thorough experience as a jurist, diplomat, and executive, my admiration as a man, my allegiance as a citizen, and my zealous support as a partisan have been faithfully accorded. Something more than two years ago we elected him as President, and when we compare him with those who have announced themselves as candidates against him for the election they all suffer by comparison. But this does not carry, express or implied, any right to control in the processes of legislation. In this matter his work was done when this treaty was negotiated, and I assume his interest now to be similar to that of any other public man in the country outside of the Senate and the House. The Members of this House and Senate should determine this legislation and thus exercise our constitutional prerogatives, "wearing our rights as royal robes, our manhood as a crown."

And to those of the majority let me say that if we are independent under the circumstances, it should be easy for you; if we can meet the front of a presidential Cabinet, you ought to be able to brave the wrathful threat of a Kitchen cabinet.

I am willing to bear my full share of public burdens. My people cheerfully bear theirs; but I dislike unwarranted discrimination. Last Friday this House passed a publicity bill. Publicity is all right, but it should apply to all. That bill should be called "An act to subject Republicans to publicity and exempt Democrats." Well, maybe we could bear publicity better than they, but I did not like the discrimination.

Another discrimination. I do not recall the action of any Republican national convention calling for free trade in our real competitive products and retaining a duty on those practically noncompetitive. I know of no caucus of our party, House or Senate, that has said that all the protection the farmers have enjoyed shall be removed, without removing or paving the way for the removal of all other protective duties. This at a time, as was stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], when consumption is forging fast upon the heels of production; just when the protective tariff, insuring us control of the home market, would make farm life profitable and homes desirable. Now to lose it after the American farmer for a hundred years, the best buyer in the world, has been forced to buy from protected American factories and mines. Again, the gentleman from Massachusetts suggests that we will soon be able, through the adoption of a constitutional amendment, to have an income tax; just when the farmers are becoming able to have reasonable incomes they will tax them. I am in favor of a reasonable income tax, but its coming at this time, when foreign competing articles are not even taxed up to a revenue basis, seems like "crowding the mourners." And recollect that the farmer's wealth is open to the view of his neighbors, the assessor, and the world; and he can not conceal his thrift as can others.

To our Republican friends who favor this proposition and still desire protection on articles in which they are interested, I recall the chivalrous offer of Artemus Ward, who was ready to sacrifice all his wife's relatives to put down the rebellion. History does not recall what the relatives said when the proposition was put to them, and history is yet to be written what the great Northwest, where Republican congressional votes, as the results of last fall's election, are thickest, will do after the final passage of this act, should it receive material Republican assistance. Unfair discrimination may be endured from the majority during the brief biennium of their incumbency, but such a discrimination by Republicans should never be tolerated.

No farmers' organization seems to have been consulted prior to the enactment of this treaty. Its immediate effect is against the farmers. They were entitled to a hearing. Altruistic and neighborly reasons have been suggested for our ratification of this measure, but to the 6,000,000 farmers this is an economic question and not one of altruism or philanthropy. It is suggested that we should give Canada better terms than we would any other Nation. If we desire to protect our own people and do so effectively, we must be more solicitous of our protection against our more immediate industrial and commercial competitor than those at a greater distance, because in the latter case the additional freight charges amount to a degree of protection.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] said that it was unfortunate that some must live close to the Canadian border. That is true, and we can not widen that line in terms of miles, but we can widen it in terms of money. If we can not say that it shall be 500 miles wide, we can say that it shall be 10 to 25 cents per bushel wide.

I desire to consider the leading reason assigned by the friends of the measure. To be perfectly frank with the country, the President, the majority, and this minority should state that the large purpose, both in negotiating the treaty and its passage through the Congress, is to reduce the cost of living; and to be equally frank in adding that the same shall be done at the sole expense of the American farmer. The majority say it will reduce the cost of living. I agree, although others opposing this bill do not do so. The only important question for debate then is, At whose expense? The products of whose toil, foresight, and prudence are affected? The various grains, forage, and meat and dairy products, all of which are produced by the American farmer, and which are practically all of the products of the American farm, are placed on the free list. If they were not to be reduced in price, then the negotiation of the treaty, the action of the last Congress, and the expense of the present extraordinary session would be all in vain, and if they are reduced in price to the purchasers, they must of necessity be reduced in price to the sellers. I know of no power in such a connection that will make the prices paid smaller and the prices received larger. That is a Herculean task fit only for the majority caucus of this House to attempt. This reduction is considerable; it should not be hastily imposed upon the farmers. If the reduction would be inconsiderable, this whole procedure would amount to "much ado about nothing."

The eloquent gentleman from North Carolina insisted that the price of wheat was the same in Canada as in the United States and therefore there would be no change, but the men who know how prices have run along the southern Canadian border and the northern American border and the testimony they give overwhelmingly establish the incorrectness of the general proposition. There is not an owner of a thousand bushels of wheat who would risk its marketing on the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina, but millions will be marketed upon the basis of the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota. I marketed my wheat last fall right from the machine, and advised my neighbors to do the same. We heard from Vermont a short time after that, and wheat has been coming down ever since, and what has occurred in wheat has been true in other foodstuffs and meats and dairy products. The supreme confidence of the American people in the ability of the present majority to reduce prices seems firmly fixed. The first reduction came with Vermont's defection. This was emphasized when Maine slumped. It was intensified with the landslide of the general election, and when reciprocity was announced the toboggan seems to have been hit so that the prices now, compared with what they were, represent already countless millions of dollars to the farmers of the land. These market movements and political results may or may not be closely related as to cause and effect, but they usually go together. Some of them feel like an eminent financier in 1904, when there was a sharp slump on the stock exchange of a great national system of railroads. He is reported as saying to his son, "Well, Jay, \$5,000,000 went to hell in the Wabash and Missouri Pacific to-day." The comforting boy said, "Never mind, father, grandpa will get it." The farmers can not take such a philosophic view of their losses, because they refuse to admit that they have grandfathers occupying coigns of vantage to catch the loss.

No, my Democratic chanticleer, this is not your sunrise. The king of your brief day was up and beaming in your waking eyes before you, golden-throated herald of the morn, even thought to crow. And he will set regardless of your protest. The more or less warranted resentment of the people was against the Republican Party. It was not in your favor except as an incident. The old remember how prices were smashed in the late fifties under the Elgin treaty and a Democratic administration.

The young remember the cheap man's paradise under your last administration. Do you think for a moment had the majority last fall declared for this you now indorse—that is, throw down our bars to Canada—that you would be in a majority to-day? No. Tammany and Dixie would not have been given an opportunity to combine against the country.

I listened to the admonition of the gentleman from North Carolina not to fool our farmer constituents upon wheat prices. I will not. I could not. I did not. They told me and are telling me now in a storm of protest by letter, card, and petition, demanding that I vote and speak against this bill, and from the farmers of my district I have not heard one favoring note on this proposition, and these people are from a State with the lowest per cent of illiteracy in the Union. My recollection is that it is a little less than 3 per cent, while that of North Carolina is 28.7 per cent, so that they probably do not need his solicitous aid.

I asked one of my Democratic farmer friends if he thought I should, in the interest of my neighbor farmers, vote for the treaty. He said, "Should the chicken vote for the ax?"

Our market for wheat is to a large extent Minneapolis and St. Paul, where our winter wheat, which does not make the whitest of flour, is mingled at a lesser price with the high-priced northern wheat and commands uniformly a larger price in Nebraska than the high-priced wheat does in Canada, equidistant from Minneapolis. Turn in competition the vast amount of Canadian product and it will drive our wheat from the Minneapolis market. We are not permitted under the pure-food law to bleach our wheat, and we must then depend on the local and southern markets or export. Our friends from the South may be getting cheaper food, and we will be selling cheaper wheat. The millers of my district agree that it will very largely reduce the price of our wheat, and the amount of this reduction will not be measured by the recent production of Canada.

One gentleman discussed the advantage to the beef producer on the farm. A few hundred head of cattle which I annually feed, a few more hogs, the few hundred tons of hay I ship, and what wheat I have produced makes this question to me a practical and familiar one. Especially as to beef. Canada can fatten her cattle on grass and hay and prepare them for slaughter just as well as can and do the cattle raisers of Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, which cattle, well prepared, furnish a strong competition for our corn and alfalfa fed beefs. I am careful not to send to the markets my corn-fed cattle when there are big runs of cattle from the Northwest fed on cheaper land, cheaper grain, and cheaper hay.

And while we speak of cattle, I recall that under the Payne bill they got our hides—now they want to get our carcasses. I hear the threat of free raw wool. Mr. Farmer, prepare for your income tax. I wonder if there is any new hammer-lock, half-Nelson, strangle-hold, or any other political grip held in readiness for the man whose children have left his home and become a majority in the cities. It is the potential production of Canada, to be stimulated into activity by this agreement, that in the years to come will be the serious, grinding competition, lessening the prices of our products, decreasing the values of our land, draining our banks, destroying the thrift of our communities, and inviting the means, enterprises, and the youth of best promise into a country, an empire in extent, which is to be developed by the drainage of American wealth and energy.

This leads me to what I regard the most important objection to this bill; that is, in this day of progress, it is distinctly a step backward. This Government and its people have lived, grown, and prospered because they have always had the courage to say that our home interests shall be protected and exalted, and upon that theory have our business and industries been upbuilt.

The farmers believed that their protection was safe until at least some great political party declared against it. So, last November they slumbered and slept. The Democratic platform of 1908 furnishes no basis for this act. The following is the Democratic declaration made at Denver. This, if you will recall, was the third epistle of William to the faithful. It was not to the Ephesians, as might be inferred from the Scripture lesson of the gentleman from Connecticut. Both the majority party and the Ephesians have gone out of the silver business. The first epistle of the same eminent author said the gold standard had slain ten thousands while the tariff had slain but a thousand. They are getting down to the small bunches now.

First it says: "We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties." How? First, "articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list." Now, that is as far as the free list

goes. Do our Democratic friends say that farm products are controlled by trusts? Are the farmers in the trust? And if they are not, will you punish them because they are not and somebody else is?

Second, "Material reduction should be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home." This measure is not under this clause, because it is a removal of the tariff and not a reduction.

Third, "Gradual reduction should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis." It can not be under that clause, because having taken off all the duty, you could scarcely tell how many more gradual reductions you should make before you restore it to a revenue basis. Do you not think you should have warned the farmers before you took this oppressive step against them? You will not be heard to say that a Republican President vouched for it. The Constitution fixes the responsibility upon a majority of this House for revenue legislation.

A large portion of this country was and appeared to be rich and fertile. These parts of the United States have been taken up and settled either through purchase or by the bestowal of the Government. As the American people looked for newer lands, the question seemed to present itself to the Government as to whether the enterprising young people should be allowed or encouraged to change their homes to the new lands of Canada, Australia, or elsewhere. It was concluded by the American people without partisan division, but by common consent, that between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans plains that seemed to be arid, mountain slopes that appeared to be rocky, swamps that were rich but undrained, presented an opportunity which by reasonable amount of governmental assistance would add many millions to the arable lands of the United States without either conquest or purchase on the part of the Government. Under the advice of wise administrations and the assistance of generous Congresses, large projects for drainage, irrigation, conservation, and reclamation have been inaugurated and made effective in various parts of this country, and over \$60,000,000 have been so spent. Large projects for drainage in the South and for irrigation in the West are under construction now. The great mountain snows that have heretofore melted in the spring and tumbled down the slope, becoming great engines of waste by erosion and otherwise, and then running purposeless to the sea, are now being captured and held in vast reservoirs to furnish water power at proper intervals and in the dry summer seasons to bathe the soil. The result of all these has been that throughout the West and South lands unproductive either through too much water or too little have been made productive. The deserts of the West have become in large sections as fertile as the Valley of the Nile, and the swamps of the South are being made as arable and productive as the rich prairies of the Middle West. Out of these projects more wheat has been raised per acre than anywhere or at any time in the history of this world. Greater fruit crops have been yielded than were yielded in the Promised Land, the final tempting fact which induced the Israelites to enter. Greater forage yield has come. Greater yield has come from these projects than was ever produced anywhere. There arose among the people of the United States, financial, philanthropic, industrial, and educational, a strong cry and a mighty movement, "Back to the soil." Men, considering carefully the social and industrial problems, welcomed this new movement. It also took on the form of redeeming and reclaiming the impoverished farms of the East and the saving and replenishing of the forestry throughout the United States. In fact, it seemed that so far as agriculture was concerned, the exploiting in a speculative way all new land and impoverishing the old had come to an end.

Perhaps the greatest shock to those interested came with the announcement of this treaty, which, by its terms, prejudiced the farming interests in the United States. It invites men of wealth to make their agricultural investment in Canada instead of in America; the young men and women to seek Canadian farm homes rather than western farm homes; to draw the money from the banks in agricultural communities to invest it in Canadian properties, bringing the level of farm prices and farm products down to the Canadian level; and to divert attention and interest from intensive conserving methods of farming and reestablishing the extensive speculative methods of farming in Canada that were in vogue 25 and 30 years ago throughout the West.

The purpose of all these projects was not speculative, but was to disperse the American people throughout its borders, where homes would be built and maintained and the drift from the farm lands of the eastern half of the United States to the

cities might be checked. Wise men, looking ahead, saw the ill results of gathering people into the great cities, every one of which has been well said to be a "great evil."

The United States has within its borders 3 cities containing collectively eight and a half million people. It has 8 cities each containing more than a half million. It has 19 cities containing more than a quarter of a million each. It has 50 cities containing more than 100,000 each. It has 108 containing each more than 50,000; totalling nearly 25,000,000. Broad and inviting as are the valleys, fields, prairies, and forests, the current of human life in America is drifting toward the cities. When this country took its first census, only 34 out of every 1,000 people lived in cities or towns. Thirty years later that number increased to 49 out of every thousand; 60 years later it had increased to 125. In 1900 it reached 311, nearly 10 times what it was at the time of the establishment of our Government. Our urban population now is about 500 out of every thousand, or 50 per cent. And this despite the fact that creative genius made the country, clothed it with beauty, and filled it with fatness; while the city was man made to pollute the air, befoul the crystal rivers, deforest the hills, rob and impoverish the soil. Yet paths to the city from every compass point are worn deep by the feet of farmers' boys and girls, leaving staid and comfortable farm life for the doubtful lure of the city's uncertainties. Were this drift new and without historical precedent, no great concern might be excited, but the tidal drift of humanity into the cities from the beginning of recorded history has led to anything but desirable national results.

Carlyle said, "A great city is a great evil," and few will question that statement. True, there is wealth gathered, culture abounds, religion rears her greatest temples, and beauty basks in the light of loveliness. Yet there is more than a counterbalance of shadow. While Dives feasts, Lazarus, surnamed Legion, fasts and starves. While purity exists, vice is nurtured, debauchery stalks, and crime multiplies. There is the air putrid, the pathway foul, heat oppresses in summer, cold pinches in winter, while manhood and womanhood, weakened and emasculated, become ready victims to sinful and insanitary surroundings. The white plague finds in congested tenements its multiplied victims. Many thousands so afflicted children are in New York and other great cities, while ten times as many daily risk infection in their disease-breeding dwellings, named more politely apartment houses. There, too, the white slave dons her garb of degradation in an atmosphere and environment which forge, fit, and fasten the chains of her shortened life and render swift and sudden the loss of her soul. The metropolitan glare lures fatally the rural moths. They see the apparent warmth and splendor of mansion and saloon. They hear the clink of gold and are thrilled with the throb of the multitude. And these young men and women, like the ant and the swallow, gregarious in their instincts, leave the ozone of mountain, the pure air of the fields, and the beauties of the valley to herd with the multitude at a risk incalculable and a price often unspeakable. The American people were just making a good beginning to turn the tide back to the pure air, rich fields, and happy farm homes, and it seemed to have the support of the great thinkers and those in authority.

Theodore Roosevelt has said:

I mean my country that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization, for our civilization rests at the bottom on the wholesomeness, attractiveness, and completeness, as well as prosperity, of life in the country. The men and women on the farms stand for what is fundamentally best and most needed in our American life. Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability, by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry nations, to supply the city with fresh blood, clean bodies, and clear brains, that can endure the terrific strain of modern life. We need the development of men in the open country, who will be in future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the Nation in time of war and its building and controlling spirit in time of peace.

President Taft has said:

If I were advising young men as to their future profession, I would say that there are greater opportunities in agriculture than in any other profession in our country. The farmer's life takes him away from that nervous exhaustion, that gambling propensity, and that bustle and rapidity that hurry men to their graves.

It seems to me a pertinent inquiry under this consideration, Where are these greater opportunities in agriculture? Are they not the lands rapidly being reenriched and reclaimed in our East, rich still and productive in the Middle West, or that part being rendered especially desirable, profitable, and productive in the great West and South in the United States? Or are they on the boundless plains of Canada? Are they among our home people, or are they among strangers? Are they under the American flag or under an alien flag? It seems to me that the choice is easy and nothing should be done to thwart it. We have lands fertile now and which can be made

productive to accommodate and provide for the people of a mighty race for a thousand years to come. If American capital, American brains, American industry, and American youth and blood are to develop any lands, it should be our own. We own the pole at the north; we own the canal at the south. We own all that we want between, where there is ample opportunity for American industry and thrift, and ample room for free, healthful, patriotic homes under the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire for the fullest and fairest trade relations between the United States and Canada.

I honestly differ with anyone who is of the opinion that this agreement in its present form is fair, just, and equitable.

In clear and unmistakable terms it discriminates against the farmer and for which I feel there is no just cause.

I am unable to understand why in the making of a treaty of this nature it was necessary to place alone the products of the farm on the free list, while at the same time practically everything the farmer purchases remains upon the protected list, ranging from 45 to 60 per cent.

It would be interesting to know—

First. Who it was, acting for the United States, made this treaty with Canada; how much time was spent in the preparation of the same; and what information was furnished, and if this is available. And I hope during this debate some one will discuss the legal features of the same. As I understand it, all revenue legislation is supposed to originate in the House of Representatives.

Second. What data, if any, has the Tariff Board given the Committee on Ways and Means concerning this agreement, and where can the same be procured?

We are paying each of five members of a Tariff Board \$7,500 a year, whose business it is, among other things, to secure the best available information upon matters like the pending treaty and give the same to the President and Congress, and recently \$250,000 was appropriated that the Tariff Board might have the fullest opportunity to make investigations and report. It does seem to me that if the Tariff Board has not been consulted, or has not had time to consider this measure, undue haste has been exercised.

If the Tariff Board is to be ignored in this, then it will afford an excuse for so doing in all future tariff legislation, and we might as well abolish the board and save the expense.

It is true that the Tariff Board has made a report (see S. Doc. No. 849, 61st Cong., 3d sess.), but in their letter of February 28, this year, addressed to the President, it seems to me that they have made it clear that they have not had sufficient time to properly investigate the matter set forth in the report; and, as much as I admire the President, I am sorry he has called Congress in extra session at this time, for it does seem to me that neither the Tariff Board, Members of Congress, nor our constituents have had sufficient time and opportunity to investigate so important a matter as this treaty; and, for one, I would have been very glad to have had an opportunity between the adjournment of the last Congress and the next regular session of this Congress to have mingled with my constituents, believing that frequent conferences and discussion respecting this treaty would have been of mutual advantage and perhaps would have avoided a good deal of unpleasant feeling that exists in the country to-day, growing out, in part, of the feeling that too much haste has been exercised in forcing this treaty upon the people of this country.

I have the honor of representing a district stretching from the Detroit River (just across from Windsor, in Canada) beyond the State capital and more than 40 miles wide.

Four wards in the city of Detroit—the twelfth, fourteenth, sixteenth, and eighteenth; six townships, bordering in part upon these wards; my home city—Pontiac—of 15,000 people; the cities of Flint and Lansing, with populations in round numbers of 40,000 each—all three splendid manufacturing cities; 75 villages, ranging in population from 50 to 3,000 or more; and the four fine agricultural counties of Oakland, Genesee, Ingham, and Livingston constitute the sixth congressional district of Michigan.

Located as these wards are, just across the river from Canada, composed of thousands of laboring men, manufacturers, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and ministers, I have not received a dozen letters from the people residing in these four wards asking me to support this treaty, and from the 75 villages and

three cities mentioned I have not had 50 letters asking me to vote for it, but from the farmers and laboring men on the farm, receiving such splendid wages as they do and who seem to appreciate the same, I have received hundreds of letters and petitions from thousands, not simply asking but pleading that I work and vote against this measure.

Now, why have I not had more requests from the wards to vote and work for this bill? Because many of their citizens lived during the last Democratic administration and have heard it said many times that the last Cleveland administration was more costly than the Civil War, and they contributed their share. Many men and women living in those wards came from the adjoining country districts and they know from bitter experience how, under the last Cleveland administration the farmer was deprived of his Detroit market, the nearest and best one which he had—deprived of it because, under the Wilson-Gorman bill, go as early as he might in the morning with the products of the farm, he would invariably find the Canadian farmer there, ready and willing to part with his products at a cheaper price.

I have, however, received possibly 30 letters from citizens and friends whose opinions I respect, in the other wards of Detroit, urging me to support the treaty, and in each and every case I replied frankly, stating my position, that I did not regard the agreement as fair, and in nearly every case where I received replies they were equally as frank in admitting my contention, but urging that we must be broad, generous, and magnanimous; others that it was only an entering wedge; and from others that it was but the beginning. I am unable to understand why we should begin by taking the whole pound of flesh from the farmer.

The farmers residing in my district are greatly dissatisfied with the terms of this treaty, and have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms. To give you an idea of the sentiment among the farmers, I will say that it has been no uncommon thing for a canvass to be made of a rural route, and some of the results are as follows: One for the treaty; 32 against; 5 for the treaty; 49 against; 3 for the treaty; 62 against.

At the recent spring election, April 3, in the township of Novi, Oakland County, 250 votes, in round numbers, were polled, as I am informed, and I have received a petition from more than 200 of that number who are opposed to the treaty.

T. J. Davis says:

I have canvassed the townships of Farmington, Novi, and Highland, with the following results: For reciprocity, 1; against reciprocity, 516.

I want to add in this connection that the feeling among the farmers in my district is not confined to the border line, but appears to be practically the same all over the district.

Many merchants, laboring men, and others who help to make up the consumers in the cities and villages sympathize with the farmer and share with him in his opinion that the treaty is jug handled.

Let us at the outset not forget that our Nation's prosperity comes from the soil.

Do you think that by passing this treaty in its present form you are giving the farmer a square deal, when by its provisions everything the farmer produces is placed on the free list, while pork and other meat products and flour remain on the dutiable list? Why should barley be put on the free list and a tax retained on barley malt? Why is lumber in the rough placed on the free list, while manufactured lumber is retained on the dutiable list? Why are biscuits, costing over 15 cents a pound, taxed 32 per cent? Is this in keeping with your efforts to reduce the cost of living, and that while cattle, sheep, and hogs are free, meats, both fresh and cured, are taxed 1½ cents per pound, and some say for the benefit of the Meat Trust, but I do not share in this opinion. Wheat is on the free list, but flour is taxed 50 cents per barrel. How much better it would be to defeat the treaty outright or to so amend it as to treat all fairly.

The farmers of the United States have enjoyed the benefits of a protective tariff for many years and been free from Canadian competition, and yet in the Middle West and in the East for many years were not prosperous, and farm values steadily decreased because of the competition of the thousands of acres of new and cheap lands beyond the Mississippi River. The fertile fields of the West offered such attractive inducements that it was quite natural that the farmers took the advice of Horace Greeley and "went West," and as a result it was impossible for the eastern farmer to compete and prosper, and so there were thousands of abandoned farms and discouraged farmers who left their farms and went into the city and villages seeking other employment.

This condition of affairs continued for 30 years or more; now that the western lands, in the main, have been taken up,

farm values in the East have increased, while the increased demand for food products has so greatly improved the prices that farmers in the East have prospered as they never prospered before. Electric railways, the automobile, good roads, rural free delivery of mails, the bicycle, and the telephone have all aided in making farm life much more attractive, so that for several years past there has been a marked decrease in the number of abandoned farms and the tide of young men and young women who were bent on going to the cities has turned backward.

There is no denying the fact that for some years, possibly 10, farming has been regarded as a profitable business and farms were being sold and exchanged at remunerative prices. Now, what is going to happen? If this treaty is made effective, it will open up millions of acres of rich, fertile, and cheap lands in the Canadian Northwest, already proving very attractive, as is shown by the hundreds of thousands of people who have gone from the United States and settled on these lands, and to me it seems certain that we must pass through another period of depression like unto that which existed east of the Mississippi River while the farm lands of the West were being taken up; and, as a natural result, Canadian lands must be greatly increased in value at our expense.

What the farmer asks for is a square deal. During the past few years a half million emigrants from the United States have settled in Canada, and they have taken with them hundreds of millions of dollars. The Dominion of Canada has an area more than 700,000 square miles larger than the whole of the United States. The possible wheat belt of Canada is given at about 80,000,000 acres. Of this vast area 6,000,000 acres are now under cultivation.

The Canadian senate committee, after a scientific examination a short time ago, reported an area of 656,000 square miles suitable for growing potatoes, 407,000 square miles suitable for raising barley, and an area of 816,000 square miles suitable for raising wheat, and pasturage lands covering an area of 800,000 square miles.

The farmer in Alberta and Saskatchewan will be as near the American market as the farmers of the West. He can farm on an extensive scale upon land which cost from \$10 to \$20 per acre, where in the Middle West similar land would be valued at from \$80 to \$100 per acre.

And again, the Canadian farmer finds a Government which is willing to loan him money for drainage, or to build elevators and storehouses, which belong to the people.

Those who lived during 1893 and 1897 know full well about the dire disaster that came to the country under a Democratic administration and by reason of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill, and I apprehend that there are none who witnessed those times who care for a repetition of the same. Who is there that does not remember also that after Mr. Cleveland was elected with a Congress Democratic in both branches, it was not necessary to wait for the enactment of the law that the people felt sure would come under a Democratic administration before business in all its branches began to languish, and there was no one business that suffered more than did the farmers of this country? Nature and nature's God were still good to them; better than the Democratic Party at that time, for they could raise horses, cattle, sheep, and abundant crops, but there was no market place where their products could be sold at a profit.

Have you observed how already, so far as the farmer is concerned, conditions are similar to what they were at the time referred to? In the language of one of my constituents, who is deeply concerned: "If the real thing is as much worse as the agitation, I pity the farmer. The bottom is about out on the prices of our farm stuff, and you can not help but realize that when the farmers are getting a good price for their products every other business is all right. Let me give you some figures: Last year lambs were selling from \$8 to \$9.25, this year for \$5; hogs sold last year at from \$9 to \$10, at present \$6.50; last year cattle were selling at \$6, now for \$4.50 to \$5; last year wheat sold from \$1.10 to \$1.22, wheat is now selling at 78 cents; last year eggs sold at 20 cents, now 13 cents. Everything else in proportion. Everything we have to buy is going the other way."

In this connection I hope I may be pardoned for relating an incident that occurred during the last month of the last campaign. One morning I had occasion to leave my hotel at Flint at 5.30 a. m. to take a train. On the way to the train I was overtaken by a farmer who lived near Flushing, and who knew me. After the morning salutation, he said, "Mr. SMITH, do you think the next House will be Democratic?" I said, "Yes." His countenance at once changed, and he seemed worried. I said, "Why are you so much concerned?" After

a moment's hesitation, he said, "I will tell you; just before the last Democratic administration I bought a farm at a fair price, but had to run in debt for the same." Farm products were so low—and he named them one after another, wool at 8 cents, sheep at 50 cents—that he lost the farm, he said.

After McKinley was elected President, following the last Cleveland administration, he purchased another farm at a good price, and proceeded to relate what he had received for farm products since that time, and as a result of the good times under a Republican administration and a protective tariff he had been able to pay for his farm and was out of debt, and he seemed glad, in addition, to tell me that he had come from his home to Flint that morning, 14 miles away, with his automobile. I thought the statement of this well-known and reputable gentleman was worth repeating often, and I proceeded from that time on to tell my audiences what this farmer had told me, and his statement was received with telling effect, for there were so many farmers, as well as others engaged in business, who had had similar experiences during that same period.

I am wondering, if this agreement becomes effective, what proportion of the farmers will be riding in automobiles, and in this connection I can not refrain from saying that I can not understand why some manufacturers of automobiles and farm machinery do not take a different view of this proposition, for they are surely going to deprive themselves of one of the best markets when the American farmer is placed where he will be if this agreement becomes a law. I say this, representing, as I believe I do, the second, if not the first, largest automobile district in the Union. I have no hesitancy in saying that if the American farmer can be let alone millions of automobiles would be purchased by them in the next few years, and, better still, they would be able to pay for them; and I want to say further that by reason of their toll and labor I know of no class of people who are better entitled to the same than they, and I expect to see in the next few years many farmers having what I call a combination automobile, in the nature of the old "Democrat wagon," which can be used for carrying either the products of the farm to market or used for passenger purposes, or both, and I say hasten the day when this will come, for it will be only another pleasure and attraction along with electric railroads, rural service, telephones, and so forth, all of which have helped to make farm life much more attractive, inviting, and agreeable, and has been a source of great help in keeping the boys and girls upon the farm instead of their going into the cities.

And, by the way, what has become of all the efforts that have been made in recent years to encourage farming upon broad and scientific methods, and pleading with the young people to remain upon the farm? It is only a short time ago when the magazines and newspapers of the country bristled with articles of this nature, and the best talent was sought for to speak upon this subject; and I recall that during his last administration President Roosevelt went on a mission of this kind and spoke at the semicentennial celebration of the Michigan Agricultural College, located in the district which honors me with a place here. I was so impressed with that speech—and am now with the good that it has done and is continuing to do—that more than once, in public and private, I have said that I wish it might be read at least twice every year in every pulpit and school throughout the land.

I want to make an appeal that more attention be given to the various agencies of distribution in this country, and when this is accomplished, the problem respecting the high cost of living will be largely solved.

I want to make this prediction. If the proposed treaty goes through in its present form history will repeat itself in a measure. The farmer was just coming into his own, so to speak. He was improving his farm, notably his buildings and fences, and building up the soil by tile drainage and other ways. In order to keep pace with the Canadian farmer, he will have to return to a system of robbing the soil if he succeeds in profitably meeting this new competition.

CONSUMERS.

What is the necessity for this legislation that we are now considering? We are told that it is in the interests of the consumer, that they may have cheaper food products. The farmer is told that by removing the duties on farm products the price will not be decreased. And the consumer is also told that by reducing the duty on farm products the cost of living will be cheaper. Are both of these statements correct? It is evident to me that if the duty on farm products is removed the same will be decreased in price, but I am not sure, nor do I believe, that the consumer is to get relief because of the prices which the farmer may receive for his products, nor do I believe it was on account of the tariff. During the last campaign the Republicans and some Democrats frankly told their

audiences that the high cost of living was world-wide and that it was not traceable to the tariff, for if it were, why were they suffering from the high cost of living in free-trade England? A careful examination of this matter will disclose that the consumer has been paying high prices traceable, notably in many cases, to freight rates, cold storage, and middlemen.

I want to quote from the report of Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, 1910, page 19:

"High prices was one of the subjects of my annual report for 1909. It was shown that for many years previous to about 1897, or a little later, the prices of farm products received by farmers were even less than the cost of production, and often little, if any, above that cost, so that during a long period of years the farmer was not thriving. It was shown also that in the upward price movement, which began about 1897, the prices received by the farmer have advanced in greater degree than those received by nearly all other classes of producers. That this should have been so was merely a matter of justice to the farmer to equalize the reward of his efforts with the rewards received in other lines of production."

On page 25 and following of the same report, he says:

"NO GROUND FOR COMPLAINT AGAINST THE FARMER.

"From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.

"PROBLEM FOR CONSUMERS, AND NOT FARMERS, TO REMEDY.

"After consideration of the elements of the matter it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroad to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment."

The high cost of living can not be traced to the farm, as statistics prove that the farmer receives less than 40 per cent of what the consumer pays for his product.

In this connection I want to say that the high cost of living is too often mistaken for the cost of high, and many times, extravagant living.

I want to give a recent experience of a farmer friend living in Ingham County, in my district, who, while visiting in Lansing, was asked to go to market and purchase a bushel of potatoes. At the market he witnessed the grocer purchase from a farmer a load of potatoes at 25 cents per bushel, and no sooner had they been unloaded from the wagon than the grocer charged the visitor 50 cents per bushel. I am not complaining at what the grocer received, but I do want to ask in all fairness, when you consider the time, trouble, and expense to which the farmer was put in raising and marketing those potatoes, at 25 cents per bushel—and I do not know how many miles he drew them to market—as compared with the labor and expense of the merchant, will it be claimed for a single moment that the farmer received an unfair price for his potatoes? Yet the consumer in this instance paid twice what the farmer received, and there were no freight rates and only one middle man.

Also from an honored constituent of mine whose letter was received some weeks ago, who says:

"I think the duty on potatoes is 25 cents per bushel. They are selling here at New Hudson for 30 cents per bushel. They are mostly put into sacks costing 7½ cents each, or 3 cents per bushel; the cost of sacking is 2 cents per bushel; commission for the dealer here is 5 cents per bushel; so you see, loaded on the car at New Hudson here the cost is 40 cents per bushel; now add the railroad freight, say to Detroit, about 4 cents per bushel; cartage and commission by commission merchant we will say is 6 cents more; this makes a total cost of 50 cents per bushel in the hands of the commission merchant in Detroit.

"The retailer buys of him at 50 cents per bushel, and we will say, to be conservative, he retails them at 15 cents per peck, or 60 cents per bushel, and many of them make 5 pecks out of a bushel, and that would mean 75 cents per bushel to the consumer. So you see the tariff on this one product at the present time does not cut much figure; but remove the duty, and if Canada has a large supply it would glut the market and they would be practically worth nothing. One of the great questions now is, How can we eliminate these middle men—potatoes selling for two and one-half times what the farmer receives?"

Without wearying you, I want to add the views of another constituent who has expressed himself in no uncertain terms:

"The boy who studies geography will tell you that the greatest populations exist in the Northern States, and there are above the Mason and Dixon line three-fourths of the population of the Union. Now, this market is to be open to the rich agri-

cultural lands of Canada; agricultural lands with \$1-a-day labor against \$2-a-day labor in the States, and more often, counting the board, \$2.50 per day than \$2. If the people wish to rob the Union of \$2,000,000,000 yearly, they could have taken it from the Treasury, but the people in favor of this reciprocity treaty rob the people of the United States of this immense sum and more besides. As the agricultural lands of the Middle West and Eastern States were already on the decline and but lately on the advance, it means, with cheaper agricultural produce, these lands will not only go back in price but also in cultivation, and, in the end, subject to the better agricultural lands of Canada with its cheap labor. After this has been accomplished, it will take a quarter of a century to rebuild our lands, due to the beauty of the forensic popular orator.

"The present high prices of our produce are due to excessive freight rates. A car at New York market quotations to-day for No. 2 timothy hay at \$18 per ton, taking out \$5.50 freight, \$1 commission, \$1 for the local dealer profits, \$1.25 for pressing, leaves the farmer \$8.75; No. 1 timothy hay on to-day's market \$15 would leave the farmer \$9.25 after the farmer runs in debt for his farm, pays 6 per cent interest, pays his hired help, and taxes. Now, behold the beautiful angel of reciprocity. Canada comes in with an enormous crop and \$4 a ton off, and the farmer has the munificent price, based on New York market to-day, of \$4.75 for No. 2 timothy hay and \$2.25 for No. 1 mixed, to pay interest, hired help, taxes, and live off of. It is a beautiful thing to enrich the farmer of Canada, open up the greatest market on earth, deplete our country of money, and reduce farm property one-third, if not more. This is all due to the great statesmanship of our leading politicians who, to favor a certain element, have advanced it. The laboring man repeats: 'Why, things will be cheaper.' But he wants to bear in mind that if the farmer makes no money, the market for the manufacturers is one-third to one-half gone. This means many a laboring man will be turned away, and even if eggs are 5 cents a dozen and butter 10 cents a pound, a soup with a lemon must do for him. The selfishness of people is apparent. The laboring man has been getting good wages, but he wants more. He wants the agricultural lands to deliver the produce he eats to his door free of cost. The advocates of reciprocity repeat that in years to come the matter will readjust itself.

"Why all this agitation for years; why a turmoil; why not leave well enough alone? The present good prices of farm products have done wonderful things. The people have gone back to the farms, finding a profit there where before there was none. The soil has become better, the latest and best implements of cultivation have been purchased, and the reliance on foreign lands to produce practically not needed. Twelve years ago, when hay was let in free, the farmer got \$3 to \$3 per ton for his hay (buyers lost money at that), 12 cents to 17 cents a pound for butter, and 10 cents a dozen for his eggs, and the result was—he left the farm.

"If you want free trade for agricultural products, then the farmer wants free trade for manufactured articles. The idea of shouldering on the farmer the weight of the opulent and trusts, the excessive freight rates, and let the merry manufacturing goat go free, as protected by a high tariff wall, is certainly the height of unfairness. If the price of farm produce was unnecessarily high and our lands could not produce the amount needed for the masses, then we had better have reciprocity. But at present—butter, 17 cents to 25 cents; eggs, 17 cents a dozen; flour becoming normal and meat on the decline; \$9 to \$10 a ton for No. 1 timothy hay; rye straw worth \$10, delivered, New York City—how much cheaper do you want the farmer to go and live? Let us look at the other side of it. Farm implements higher; all manufactured goods higher, amounting from \$2 to \$4 a suit; linens and cotton goods out of sight; coal higher; freight rates higher; shoes higher; wages 10 years ago \$1 per day, now \$2 to \$2.50 per day. Still the people high in office want to make a great swat at agriculture and prate great things, but they are not telling the people that their cost of living has been due more to excessive freight rates to pay dividends on watered stock, on manufactured goods and protection of trusts, who have raised the prices of every manufactured commodity. This would not do at all. The people who have the money blind the rest with their great ideas of benevolence at the expense of the agricultural community. There is not one single good idea in reciprocity at present, and certainly none in the future, unless a famine should strike the country."

I want to give you now a practical illustration of what has been occurring and is now occurring right here in Washington, and where five middlemen are employed before the consumer gets his products from the producer.

I am indebted to Mr. C. Louis Allen, president of the Co-operative Commercial Orchards of Virginia, for the same. Mr.

Allen is known to some of the Members of this body, and especially to the Members from his own State, and he is a man of high character and standing. At the present time he is the owner of an apple orchard in Montana with 7,200 trees, and who, by reason of his experience, believes that the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia is one of the best fields in this country for apple orchards. I have said this much of him that you may know who he is, and that what he has to say in this connection ought to have weight, and I suppose his statement could be verified and duplicated over and over again, not only with reference to apples, but with practically everything else, that is the product of the farm, which clearly shows that the charge which is so often made that the farmer is receiving too much for his products is not true, when it can be shown that from two to five middlemen, with other causes, are the ones who have brought the high cost of living to the doorway of the consumer.

Mr. Allen says:

"A few figures which show how little of the apple consumer's dollar really goes to the producer. The original letters from the growers mentioned are on file in my office.

"F. S. Dunham, of Chelan, Wash., received 88½ cents a box for Jonathans, which were sold by the fruit dealer at the corner of Fourteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C., for \$4 a box.

"G. B. Kinney, of Peshastian, Wash., received \$1.52 a box for apples which were sold in this city for 75 cents a dozen.

"W. E. Wright, of Peshastian, Wash., received \$1.52 a box for apples which cost the Washington City retailer \$3.25 a box, and which he sold for \$4.50 a box.

"S. M. Neher, of Wenatchee, Wash., was paid \$1.41 a box for apples which were sold to Washington City consumers at 10 cents each, three for 25 cents.

"The first middle man in these transactions is the local fruit growers' association.

"The second, the commission merchant in New York City, such as Steinhart & Kelley and Rae & Hatfield.

"The third, a broker, such as Samuel Haynes, of New York.

"The fourth, the local wholesale dealer here in Washington City, like Mr. Engel; he gets his apples by local freight from New York.

"The fifth, the local Italian fruit dealer or groceryman is the fifth middle man to sell the apples to the consumer."

Secretary Wilson asks this pertinent question:

"Why do not consumers buy directly from the farmers? A distribution of farm products in this simple way has already begun in England, where cooperative organizations of farmers are selling by direct consignment to cooperative organizations of consumers in cities.

"Farmers cooperative selling associations are numerous in this country, but cooperative buying associations among the people of cities and towns are few. Aside from buying associations, maintained by farmers, hardly any exist in this country. It is apparent, therefore, that the consumer has much to do to work out his own salvation with regard to the prices that he pays. Potatoes were selling last spring, in some places where there has been overproduction, for 20 cents, and in some places for even 9 cents per bushel at the farm, while at the same time city consumers in the East were paying 50 cents to 75 cents per bushel, although there was nothing to prevent them from combining to buy a carload or more of potatoes directly from the grower and for delivery directly to themselves."

I am sure that further comment is unnecessary as to the prices which the farmer receives for his products.

An urgent appeal is being made to the toiling masses of the cities, and they are told that through the adoption of this treaty the cost of living will be greatly reduced. They are not told that the products from the farm required for the daily needs of the average family do not form the principal cost of living, and that for every dollar which the laboring man spends for products from the farm which come to his table, he spends five times that amount for the actual necessities of life.

I wish I could say to the great multitude of consumers in cities and villages that I believed that the enactment of the treaty into law would benefit them, but I do not. Grant that it will cheapen food prices for the sake of the argument, but you must not forget that it may bring about conditions like we had a few years ago, when it mattered not how cheap things were, you could not get them for yourself and family, for you could not sell your labor with which to buy the necessities of life.

I can not but regard this treaty as one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been presented to Congress for many years.

The people of the cities and villages in some localities seem to have an eye single only to their own selfish interests, losing sight of the fact that when the farmer prospers it is a pretty

sure index that everybody else is prospering. I regret to say some manufacturers, still protected by a tariff averaging about 40 per cent, are redoubling their efforts to have this treaty ratified.

I have been diligent in searching for the best definition for reciprocity, but I never knew before that reciprocity means giving something for nothing. You, upon the other side of the Chamber, claim that reciprocity is an original Democratic principle, and that the Republicans have taken it from you. If this is Democratic reciprocity, I hope you will take it and make the most of it; but I warn you, like the Wilson-Gorman bill, it will come back to plague you.

A word further to our friends upon the other side of the Chamber. The slogan of your party for years has been that you are a party for "tariff for revenue only"—a tariff that will not give special protection and advantages to special classes, and thus build up in this country great monopolies and unwarranted special interests.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. UNDERWOOD, has introduced H. R. 4413, commonly known as the farmers' free-list bill. You say you are going to pass it. This applies to the whole world, which means that, so far as Canada is concerned, at least, you are willing to abandon the principle of tariff for revenue only with reference to the articles mentioned in this free-list bill.

Now, I want to invite you, as an evidence of your sincerity and good faith, to offer an amendment to this bill, treaty, pact, agreement, or whatever you choose to call it, and pass it in that form. You can do it, for you have 63 majority, and you will get some votes from this side of the Chamber. Please do not make the excuse that this is not a bill, but a treaty, and that you can not do it, or that this treaty or agreement is so sacred that it can not be amended.

There are those of us who feel that before the proposed treaty is enacted into law it should be substantially amended, and it seems that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who, during the last session of Congress and for some years previous was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, entertained similar views and evidently felt the necessity, as well as the fairness, of having the agreement amended. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, this year, page 2520, I find the following:

"Mr. CLARK. I wish to suggest to my party fellows that if this bill is passed [and that is the bill which is now under consideration] it is not the end of the chapter or the end of the world. At high noon on the 4th of March we shall come into the possession of this House, and if this treaty does not go as far as we want it to go, we can then make it go still further. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

"Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman says his party will come into power after the 4th of March.

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the House.

"Mr. DALZELL. Suppose this treaty does not pass at this session of Congress. What will his party do with it if it is put up to them at the next session of Congress?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. 'Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.' [Laughter and applause.]

"Mr. DALZELL. Would you pass this bill?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think we would amend it and pass it."

So he did have in mind that it should be amended and many others are of the same opinion. But we are told when we make any suggestions of this nature that it would vitiate the agreement, and that to change it in any manner or form would prevent the acceptance of it by the Canadian Parliament. Well and good; let that be as it may. Are we more concerned in legislating for Canada, for whose people I entertain the greatest respect, who pay no taxes here and who are in no way interested in our Government, or are we legislating for our own people? But to show you that we are entirely warranted in making such amendments as we feel in right and justice ought to be made to the same, I want to quote from the same date and page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] had to say in this connection. The gentleman from Massachusetts was addressing a question to Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and said:

"Is the gentleman aware that when the reciprocity treaty was arranged between France and Canada in 1907 to 1909 that, as a matter of fact, the French Senate did amend the treaty in a very important respect and that Canada promptly came to terms?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That might be. I do not say that Canada would not come to terms.

"Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Then it will not destroy the agreement.

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not say that Canada would not come to terms if we changed it and I do not say we would not come to terms if Canada changed it, but what I do say is that if either one of us changes it it must go back to the commissioners again, and that is an endless-chain performance that I have no use for."

In view of the manifest discrimination and unfairness of the treaty, it does seem to me that we are fully warranted in making at least one trial, as did the French, to amend this bill.

In the name of thousands of farmers in my district who, in the main, without regard to party, are strongly opposed to the passage of this treaty in its present form, and in behalf of the millions of farmers in this country, who are entitled to be accorded the same treatment as manufacturers and others, I protest against the adoption of this treaty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely fitting that the debate on this measure, which is likely to prove the beginning of a revolution to free the people from industrial bondage, should be in progress this day, April 19, the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, that marked the beginning of the American Revolution and was the first fight for national freedom.

This is Patriot's Day, a legal holiday in Massachusetts, as it should be throughout the Union. This is also patriots' day in the House, and may the battle here result as gloriously as the memorable one in 1775.

Some of the new Members of the House who have spoken on this most important subject have felt obliged to apologize for doing so. It does not appear to me, as one of the new Members, necessary to do so, for it is my firm belief that it was the desire of the people of this country to see enacted just such legislation as this bill proposes that resulted in so many new Members being elected to this Congress. They sent us here to help by voice and vote make changes in legislation that will bring relief from the burden of trust rule that has enriched the few at the cost of the great mass of the people.

There is not time in the few minutes allowed me, nor desire after the able presentations of the general benefits of this reciprocity pact that have been made, to go into a lengthy discussion of this bill. I simply desire to show to those who appear to be so solicitous about the farmers; who believe, or, at least, say that farmers have not had opportunity to know what this agreement means; who state that the farmers are unorganized and helpless, how the farmers of Connecticut, a New England State, almost a border State, feel and act about it.

In the Connecticut Legislature, now in session, are 94 members who are farmers. They have there and have had for several sessions a farmers' club or association, to which only those making farming their business can belong. They hold stated meetings during the session, at which all matters affecting farmers, directly or indirectly, are considered carefully. They have faithful and competent officers and an executive committee who keep watch of all legislation of interest to them when introduced and during committee stages. They know their business and know it well.

A resolution was introduced in the present session of the Connecticut Legislature indorsing this reciprocity bill when it was before the last Congress, scarcely more than a month ago, and it passed the house, in which there are more than 90 farmer members, without a dissenting vote and passed the senate with only 6 votes in opposition. That is the record of the Republican Legislature of Connecticut and its farmers' association. [Applause.]

This is not a partisan question, in my opinion. I do not care if it is. I do not care whether you call it a Republican measure or a Democratic measure. The fact that it was arranged on the part of this country by a Republican President makes no difference to me. It is a measure along Democratic lines; is in accord with Democratic campaign promises that are being kept; is in accord with Republican campaign promises that were not kept.

It is a measure that the people of this country, irrespective of political belief, are demanding for their relief, and any party that may be responsible for its defeat will have to suffer the consequences.

Good Republicans, basing support on party lines, can vote for it because it has the Republican President for its sponsor.

Good Democrats can vote for it because it has the indorsement of two party caucuses and the record of years of advocacy. All can and should vote for it, because it is right and calculated to be of benefit to the country at large. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WHITE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of B. F. Jackson, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, April 20, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 258) for the relief of Thomas W. Best; Committee on Agriculture discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 742) for the relief of the survivors of the shipwreck of the steamboat *Sultana*; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6080) granting pensions to widows of soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6081) to amend the act approved March 23, 1906, entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6082) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bath, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6083) to amend an act entitled "An act for the widening of Benning Road, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1908; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) amending section 1608 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend chapter 55 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,'" approved February 23, 1905; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6085) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6086) to provide for the erection of a public building at Middletown, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 6087) granting pensions to members of the military organization of 1862, known as "Squirrel Hunters"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6088) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 6089) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 6090) to further amend an act to amend an act to amend section 4400, title 52, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the regula-

tion of steam vessels, approved August 2, 1882, and also to amend section 4414, title 52, of the Revised Statutes, "Regulation of steam vessels," approved March 1, 1895; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6091) to extend the provisions of the existing bounty-land laws to the officers and enlisted men, and the officers and men of the boat companies, of the Florida Seminole Indian War; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6092) authorizing the Secretary of War to grade and fill certain ponds and lowlands on the military reservation at or near Fort Taylor, Key West, Fla., and to appropriate money therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6093) providing for the marking and protection of the battlefield known as "Dade's massacre," in Sumter County, Fla., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6094) increasing the pensions of those now receiving or entitled to pensions under the acts of Congress approved July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6095) to amend section 1044 of the Revised Statutes relating to limitations in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 6096) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes, and to amend and revive the same; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6097) to amend an act to compel officers and employees traveling in the interest of the Government to file a verified itemized sworn statement of their travel allowance with heads of departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6098) to authorize the Campbell Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River from a point in Dunklin County, Mo., to a point in Clay County, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS: Resolution (H. Res. 108) for investigation of plans of organization and system of deliberative divisions in vogue in foreign parliaments, with a view to maintaining the deliberative functions of such bodies and the privilege of individual members to participate in legislation during its formative stages; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: Resolution (H. Res. 109) to investigate the Post Office Department and service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 110) authorizing Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prepare certain index in relation to advances in rates by carriers; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6099) for the relief of Charles S. Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6100) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Bloom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Billhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6102) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6103) granting an increase of pension to James Belstie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) granting an increase of pension to Michael G. Clapsaddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) granting an increase of pension to George D. Edgeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6106) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6107) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) granting an increase of pension to David Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6109) granting an increase of pension to John Herndon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6110) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Huber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6111) granting an increase of pension to James M. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Inman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6113) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6114) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Maskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6115) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6116) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6117) granting an increase of pension to Jasper D. Ooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6118) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to Harvey B. Ragon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6120) granting an increase of pension to Joshua H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) granting an increase of pension to Fred J. Reiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) granting an increase of pension to John G. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) granting an increase of pension to Michael Tuorrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6124) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Troup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) granting an increase of pension to William M. Van Marter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6126) granting an increase of pension to John Zedeker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6127) granting a pension to Annie E. Farber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6128) for the relief of Hewson L. Peeke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6129) granting a pension to H. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6130) granting a pension to John Lilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6131) granting a pension to William C. Stanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6132) granting a pension to Peter Minor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6133) granting a pension to Clara W. Griego; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6134) granting a pension to Antonio Salazar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6135) granting a pension to Leonisco Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6136) granting a pension to Nemeo Valencio; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6137) granting a pension to Juan Deciderio Valdez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6138) granting a pension to Theodor Reimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6139) for the relief of Alfred Miller; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6140) for the relief of Reyes Salas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6141) for the relief of Serapio Romero; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6142) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6143) granting an increase of pension to Frank O. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6144) granting a pension to Amanda S. Teichman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 6145) correcting military record of Joseph R. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 6146) granting a pension to Peter Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6147) granting a pension to Otto Mehl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) granting a pension to Charles F. Friedeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 6149) for the relief of Robert J. Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6150) granting an increase of pension to Willet Teller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6151) granting an increase of pension to William W. Baughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Zurner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6153) granting an increase of pension to Martin C. Rosencrantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6154) granting a pension to Alice Rothe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) granting a pension to George W. Erway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6156) granting an increase of pension to Math. L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6157) granting an increase of pension to Duane R. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6158) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Older; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Frank Munn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) granting an increase of pension to William Bennet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 6161) granting a pension to Samuel W. Pescay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to James H. Waller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) granting a pension to Florence Chinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 6164) granting an increase of pension to Roy E. Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6165) granting an increase of pension to Dennis H. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6166) granting an increase of pension to John Stephan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 6167) granting an increase of pension to Anna O. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6168) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Walburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6169) granting a pension to Martha Langeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) granting a pension to Jacob B. S. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) granting a pension to William P. O'Haver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to Bernard F. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6173) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Summerville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6174) for the relief of E. H. Hault; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6175) for the relief of Charles L. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6176) granting an increase of pension to James C. Wildes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) for the relief of the estate of H. J. Royal, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6178) granting an increase of pension to James Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 6179) granting an increase of pension to James Earley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6180) granting an increase of pension to Ross M. Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) granting an increase of pension to James W. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6182) granting an increase of pension to William G. Mittel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6183) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Chisman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6184) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Jeffery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6185) granting an increase of pension to Alpha H. Shlditz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to Cicero Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6187) granting an increase of pension to E. B. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6188) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6189) granting an increase of pension to Edward Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6190) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6191) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel B. Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6192) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hoskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6193) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6194) granting an increase of pension to John Seals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6195) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Swartwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6196) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Stid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6197) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6198) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hagerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) granting an increase of pension to George Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6200) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) granting an increase of pension to John L. Hefling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6202) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6204) granting an increase of pension to Leander D. Bevan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6205) granting an increase of pension to Alex Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) granting an increase of pension to Moses W. Edgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6207) granting an increase of pension to Lindley Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Dock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Poorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6210) granting an increase of pension to William H. Host; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6211) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gooding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6212) granting an increase of pension to John Melville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6213) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Kinkade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6214) granting an increase of pension to Simeon J. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6216) granting an increase of pension to John N. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) granting an increase of pension to David Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Spriggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6219) granting an increase of pension to George H. Berstler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6221) granting an increase of pension to Perry P. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) granting an increase of pension to Leven B. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6223) granting a pension to Benjamin Penn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) granting a pension to Hannah J. Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) granting a pension to Caroline A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6226) granting an increase of pension to James B. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6227) granting an increase of pension to Victor M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 6228) granting a pension to Lucy Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6229) retiring Thomas Harrison, a clerk in the Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6230) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) granting an increase of pension to George W. Dalrymple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 6232) granting an increase of pension to W. C. May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) granting an increase of pension to Weston Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) granting an increase of pension to Edwin G. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) granting an increase of pension to William S. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 6237) for the relief of James Coey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 6238) granting an increase of pension to James Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6239) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Branagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) granting an increase of pension to Albin F. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6241) granting a pension to Mrs. Forest Harmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6242) granting a pension to B. K. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) granting an increase of pension to David S. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) granting an increase of pension to William R. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) granting a pension to John H. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6247) granting a pension to James H. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6248) granting a pension to Lewis A. Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 6249) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Boynton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6250) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 6251) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Crowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6252) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ella Fales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6253) granting an increase of pension to Lucien E. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6254) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEEPER: A bill (H. R. 6255) for the relief of Charles C. Baumann; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) for the relief of George A. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to Paul Kempter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 6258) granting a pension to Adam Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to C. W. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6260) granting a pension to Fannie F. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 6261) granting an increase of pension to David Curfman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) granting an increase of pension to Lyman H. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6263) granting a pension to Philip D. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6264) granting a pension to John T. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) for the relief of George H. Smythe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 6266) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Mobley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6267) granting an increase of pension to Lorin B. Ohlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) granting a pension to Joseph H. Waters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6269) for the relief of James D. Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6270) for the relief of Samuel B. Ried; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6271) for the relief of the heirs of Adam L. Eichelberger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. Hill Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 6273) granting a pension to Robert D. McMillion; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6274) granting a pension to Mary E. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 6275) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Moffitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) granting an increase of pension to H. C. Kightlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6277) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) granting a pension to Theodore Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6279) granting a pension to Charles J. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) granting a pension to Lydia Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) granting a pension to Mary Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6282) granting an increase of pension to James M. Totten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6283) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rossiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) for the relief of Thomas B. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WICKLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 6287) for the relief of the estate of Vamalle Basile, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 6288) granting an increase of pension to Albert Morseman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6289) granting an increase of pension to Charlie C. Bane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6290) granting an increase of pension to Marvin A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) granting a pension to Amelia M. Lacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, requesting the withdrawal of the troops from Mexico border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Cleveland Chamber of Commerce requesting tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Case Bros. and five other merchants of Shreve, Ohio, in opposition to the enactment of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany bills granting pensions to Duane R. Moore, Henry M. Older, and William Bennett, and increasing pension of Frank Munn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 3299; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 3296; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Women's Club of West Bend, Wis., for the passage of a law for the investigation of the communication of tuberculosis by dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Irish-American and German-American societies of Kansas City, Mo., against the enactment of a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, requesting an increase in monthly allowance of pension to \$30 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of citizens of the twelfth congressional district, State of Indiana, protesting against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harriet Walburn, for increase pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Women's Club of Monroe, Wis., favoring the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Women's Club of Monroe, Wis., requesting legislation providing for the inspection of dairy and meat animals and their products, and of all food products known to harbor and spread germs of disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Petitions of business men of Salem, Washington County; New Albany, Floyd County; Mitchell, Lawrence County; and Paoli, Orange County, all in the State of Indiana, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Berlin Grange, No. 966, against the reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of employees of the Eastern Talc Co. in the State of Vermont, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petitions of J. M. McConnell and 11 others, of Cadiz, Harrison County; Frank Murphy and 15 others, of Steubenville; H. B. Robinson and 6 others, of Toronto, Jefferson County; and M. M. Webster and 5 others, of Scio, Harrison County, all in the State of Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Victor M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Henry T. Oxnard, New York; William M. Ward, Boston; and John H. Eastwood, of Belleville, N. J., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, opposing the proposed legislation to place boots, shoes, and leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Niagara Falls Council, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Papermakers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Fisher Grange, No. 790, of Harrisville, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. John R. Gregory and 62 other residents of Bay City, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 383, of the Sixty-first Congress; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Resolutions of Highland Grange, No. 364, Patrons of Husbandry, North Penobscot, Me., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of A. F. Bradley and others, of Carthage, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, requesting that bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolutions of the Senate of New Jersey and New Market Grange, No. 152, Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Savona (N. Y.) Grange, No. 302; Pomona Grange, Steuben County, N. Y.; and Prattsburg (N. Y.) Grange, No. 112, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: Petition of various citizens of the State of Michigan protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Jackson, Manchester, and Northville, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the rate imposed on the Women's National Weekly; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Albert Morseman, Tipton, Lenawee County, State of Michigan, for increase in pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 20, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the congregations of the Church of the Brethren, of Harrisonburg, Va.; the Church of the Brethren, of Stillwater, Okla.; of the Spring Branch Church, of Avery, Mo.; of the Arcadia Congregation of the Church of the Brethren, of the Church (Dunkard) of the Brethren, and of the National Christian Congress Association of America, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict the sale and traffic in opium, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of Local Union No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., and of sundry citizens of Ossipee, Swanzey, Franklin, and Berlin, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Kenilworth and Hampton Park, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of a grade crossing at Mead Street NE., connecting Minnesota Avenue and Kenilworth Avenue, in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented memorials of Genesee Grange; Lake View Grange, No. 970, of Westport; Stockton Grange, No. 316; Angelica Grange, No. 108; Akron Grange, No. 903; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Honeoye Falls Grange, No. 6; Dewittville Grange, No. 480; Cayuga County Pomona Grange; Marathon Grange, No. 455; Ionia Grange, No. 903; Bristol Valley Grange, No. 1080; Canisteo Grange, No. 460; Sylvan Grange, No. 825; Columbia County Pomona Grange; Gergen Grange, No. 163; Camden Grange; Gowanda Grange, No. 1164; Hanover Grange, No. 595; Pittsford Grange, No. 424; Elma Grange, No. 1179; South Bristol Grange, No. 1107; Emerald Grange; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Alfred Grange, No. 1097; Granger Grange; Onondaga County Pomona Grange; Heuvelton Grange, No. 947; Gates Grange, No. 421; Bethlehem Grange; Westville Grange, No. 540; West Laurens Grange, No. 782; Richfield Grange, No. 771; Franklinville Grange; Bloomingburg Grange, No. 1197; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Denmark Grange, No. 535; Byron Grange, No. 395; La Fargeville Grange, No. 15; Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127; Dresden Grange, No. 1167; Berlin Grange, No. 966; Highland Grange, No. 22; West Groton Grange, No. 818; Perry Grange, No. 1163; Alsten Grange, No. 1138; Mapleton Grange, No. 613; Phoenix Grange, No. 920; Settlement Grange, No. 706; Kent Grange, No. 1145; Elkdale Grange; Cazenovia Grange, No. 1048; Clarendon Grange, No. 1083; Mentz Grange, No. 1156; Susquehanna Valley Grange, No. 1132; Upton Lake Grange, No. 802; Glendale Grange, No. 548; Mertensia Grange; Walkkill River Grange, No. 983; Orange County Pomona Grange; Seneca Castle Grange, No. 359; Russia Grange, No. 630; Hurley Grange, No. 963; Albion Center Grange; Plessis Grange, No. 629; Seneca Grange, No. 284; Cassadaga Grange, No. 659; West Groton Grange, No. 818; Five Corner Grange, No. 1000; Ulster Grange, No. 1065; Wawarsing Grange, No. 956; Weedsport Grange, No. 995; Floyd Grange, No. 665; Chaumont Grange, No. 855; Mapleton Grange, No. 1207; Scotch Bush Grange, No. 699; Pittstown Grange, No. 1311; Cottage Grange, No. 829; Ellery Grange, No. 353; Amherst Grange, No. 1131; Orange County Pomona Grange; Tully Grange; Kingsbury Grange, No. 1085; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; Clifton Park Grange; East Freetown Grange, No. 1187; Kent Grange, No. 1145; Whallonsburg Grange, No. 954; Westville Grange, No. 1047; Pamela Grange, No. 68; Brockport Grange, No. 93; Subordinate Grange, No. 462; Cronomer Valley Grange, No. 982; Amherst Grange, No. 1131; Stockbridge Valley Grange, No. 1304; Machias Grange, No. 994; Granby Grange, No. 927; Rushville Grange; Marilla Grange, No. 1133; Newfane Grange, No. 1159; Darien Grange, No. 1063; Towlesville Grange, No. 430; Bethany Grange, No. 748; Fairport Grange; Almond Grange, No. 1102; East Schuyler Grange, No. 576; Gansewort Grange, No. 832; Perch River Grange, No. 626; Red Hook Grange, No. 918; Little Falls Grange, No. 611; West Sandlake Grange, No. 949; Pierstown Grange, No. 793; Watertown Grange, No. 7; Wolcott Grange; Delaware County Pomona Grange; Clintondale Grange, No. 957; North Manlius Grange; Saratoga Grange, No. 1209; Merley Grange, No. 988; Elbridge Grange, No. 220; Wicopee Grange; Champlain Grange,

No. 383; Penfield Grange, No. 750; Transit Grange, No. 1092; Clarksville Grange, No. 871; Owasco Lake Grange, No. 1074; Scottsburg Grange; Orwell Grange, No. 66; Chase Mills Grange, No. 985; Otisville Grange, No. 1020; Jasper Grange, No. 619; Albion Grange; Mount Pleasant Grange, No. 349; Barnes Corners Grange, No. 85; Ausable Valley Grange, No. 973; Old Chatham Grange, No. 925; and Jefferson County Grange, of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of sundry citizens of Solway, Ballston Spa, Fort Edward, Syracuse, Albany, Medina, Otisville, Niagara Falls, Clay, Westtown, Ithaca, New York, Hillsdale, Belfast, Albion, Highland, and Oswego, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California, of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called Sulloway old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURNHAM presented memorials of Narragansett Grange, No. 46, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bedford, and of Prospect Grange, of Mount Vernon, and sundry citizens of Swanzey, Ossipee, Franklin, Berlin, and Walpole, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 2.

Resolved by the Senate of the Eighteenth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Members of the Congress of the United States for the State of Colorado be, and they hereby are, requested to advocate in the Sixty-second Congress the time-honored principle of a tariff for revenue only, in that they demand an immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties; that articles in competition with trust-controlled products be placed upon the free list, and material reductions be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and graduate reductions be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis and render it impossible for private monopolies to find shelter behind high protective duties, whereby they are enabled to make combinations in restraint of honest trade and to raise the prices of the necessities of life to the American consumer; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered of record of the general assembly and copies be forwarded to the Representatives of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

STEPHEN R. FITZGERALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, March 17, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 18th day of March, A. D. 1911, at 9:46 o'clock a. m.

JAMES B. PEARCE, Secretary of State,
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr., Deputy.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 24.

Resolved by the senate, the house concurring, That the governor is hereby authorized and requested to protest His Excellency President William H. Taft against his approval of the Weeks bill, passed by the United States Senate on February 15 and now before the President for his approval or veto, as in the opinion of the General Assembly of Colorado such bill, if it becomes a law, would be inimical to the best interests of the West, as set forth in the senate joint memorial No. 11, which passed the senate on February 13, to which reference is hereby made.

STEPHEN R. FITZGERALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, March 3, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on March 7, 1911, 10:40 a. m.

JAMES B. PEARCE, Secretary of State,
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr., Deputy.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.